

BULLETIN OF  
THE JOHN RYLANDS  
LIBRARY  
MANCHESTER

Edited by the Librarian

---

VOL. 40

SEPTEMBER, 1957

No. 1

---

NOTES AND NEWS

THE John Rylands Library, the memorial of Mrs. Enriqueta Rylands to her husband, was the design of Basil Champneys, a famous London architect. It took ten years to build and was first opened to the public on New Year's day 1900. Although architecturally magnificent the building was sadly lacking in accommodation for the operational needs of a working library. No provision had been made for expansion, so that shortly after its opening Mrs. Rylands was called upon to provide two additional book rooms at the rear of the building. At the same time inquiries were made as to the possibility of acquiring land for future extension.

THE ISAAC  
WOLFSON  
ANNEXE

In the year 1909 the Governors secured a plot of land of 1,200 square yards adjoining the Library at its northern end. In 1911 a scheme was drawn up for the utilization of part of this site with the avowed purpose of remedying the shortcomings in the original design. The plan included three additional administrative rooms, a workroom for the Librarian, common-rooms for the staff, and additional stack rooms for the storage of books. Work was begun on the new extension in 1913, but the intervention of the war delayed its completion till 1920.

In the year 1952 the Pilgrim Trust came to the aid of the Library with a substantial grant enabling it to provide new stack room accommodation for 40,000 books.

In the year 1953 Rylands and Sons, the merchant firm founded by John Rylands, passed under the control of Mr. Isaac Wolfson. Two years later an approach was made to Mr. Wolfson on the ground of the association of the Library with the

firm, pointing out the need of the Library for an additional building. His response was instant and generous, with the result that an annexe costing approximately £30,000 is now in course of erection. The ground floor will be occupied by a photographic studio. The two upper floors will be devoted to the storage and display of special collections. Valuable shelf space will in consequence be released in the main Library.

At a ceremony held on 25 July last the foundation stone was laid by Mr. Isaac Wolfson. The Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University, Professor W. Mansfield Cooper, chairman of the Council of Governors of the Library, presided. In welcoming Mr. Wolfson he recalled the great struggle the Library has been making to house appropriately its continually expanding collections of books and manuscripts. Mr. Wolfson's generosity had in consequence enabled the Governors to realize one of the major parts of their programme.

In the course of his address to the gathering Mr. Wolfson said: "I regard it as a privilege from which I derive great personal pride that the Governors have honoured me by associating my family name with that of the new annexe. That it should remain as a testimony I am, in all humility, truly grateful. We who devote most of our time to trade and commerce are aware at times, even acutely aware, that our activities and our successes are unsatisfying unless some of the results can be of benefit to the sciences and to the arts. The fame of the John Rylands Library is world wide. Since I became associated with it I have learned with pleasure how widespread and high is the esteem in which it is held by universities, learned institutions and scholars the wide world over." The Lord Mayor of Manchester (Alderman Leslie Lever, M.P.), an Honorary Governor, thanked Mr. Wolfson on behalf of the Trustees and Governors of the Library.

In a period of just over six months a sum of £50,000 has been promised or received towards the Library appeal, and support has been generous and widespread. There have been more than 260 contributors, apart from anonymous donors, both from this country and abroad.

THE APPEAL  
FOR  
£100,000



Particular mention should be made of three large gifts : £15,000 from the Pilgrim Trust, £5,000 from the Lancashire Steel Corporation Ltd. in memory of the late Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, and £5,000 from the City of Manchester. The directors of public and private companies have contributed generously and so have private individuals and groups, such as associations in the printing and allied trades, various branches of Assistant Librarians, Social and Rotary Clubs, and the sixth form of a girls' school. It is particularly pleasing to find neighbouring Universities like Liverpool, Leeds and Sheffield anxious and able to support the Library with donations. Manchester University, as many readers are aware, already makes a substantial annual grant.

The second £50,000 will be harder to raise, but it would be easier if more people knew of the Appeal. Readers of the BULLETIN will have seen the copy of the Appeal included with the March issue. Those who have not been able to contribute themselves would be giving real help if they would make the Library's need for funds more widely known. Impressive evidence of the widespread support for the Library was afforded at a public meeting held in the Town Hall, Manchester, on 26 June, called by the Lord Mayor, at which the Manchester Chambers of Commerce and Trade, the Federation of British Industries and the National Union of Manufacturers were represented on the platform. Among the speakers supporting the Appeal were the Lord Mayor, Professor Mansfield Cooper, Alderman Mary L. Kingsmill Jones, a Governor of the Library and a former Lord Mayor of Manchester, Mr. Frank Rostron, President of the Chamber of Commerce, and the Bishop of Manchester, a Governor of the Library.

In the BULLETIN for September 1953 (Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 1-9) an account was given of a generous donation made to the Library by Mrs. H. D. Rawnsley of Allan Bank, Grasmere, Westmorland, of 600 letters and papers (1873-1902) relating to John Ruskin, over 500 of which are holograph. A survey of this collection by Mr. Robin Skelton

LETTERS  
OF RUSKIN  
AND CARLYLE

appeared in a subsequent number (March 1955) and that portion of it concerning the Guild of St. George forms part of the material used by Miss Margaret E. Spence in an article printed below (pp. 147 ff.). The Library has recently acquired by purchase two additions to these materials, one comprising letters from Ruskin to Mrs. and Miss Strode of Edinburgh, the other letters written to him by Carlyle. The former correspondence had its origin in a parcel of her daughter's drawings which Mrs. Strode sent to Ruskin in 1883 and which he considered "the most entirely delicious and right animal sketches I've ever seen". Ruskin, as is well known, was keen to encourage young artists with talent and this correspondence, which continued until at least October 1886, is filled with advice and detailed instructions to Miss Strode regarding the manner in which she should develop her artistic abilities. He sends, too, for copying, reproductions of works by Turner, Bewick, Landseer and Francesca Alexander, "the happiest woman I know"; some thirty of Miss Alexander's letters were presented to the Library by Mrs. Rawnsley and now form Eng. MS. 1165. Ruskin's correspondence with the Strodes has apparently been hitherto unknown and the present collection, which numbers twenty-six items, forms only part of it, for a number of envelopes addressed to Miss Strode, the contents of which are missing, accompanies the letters. The Carlyle letters, too, are unpublished. Written between July 1855 and July 1874, seven to Ruskin and one to his father, John James Ruskin, they contain much interesting literary and personal gossip and reports by Carlyle on the progress of "my Prussian affairs". Professor C. R. Sanders of Duke University, North Carolina, has kindly informed us that only thirty-three letters from Carlyle to Ruskin and Ruskin père have been traced. Of these, twelve have been published and three are known only from references. The present acquisition together with eight letters at Yale and two in the National Library of Scotland make up the eighteen which still remain unpublished. Professor Sanders has drawn attention to other Carlyle correspondence in the Library in articles published in the *BULLETINS* of September 1955 and March of this year.



We are indebted to Mrs. Charles Booth of Ulverscroft, co. Leicester, for the generous gift of well over five hundred letters and papers of the Spring Rice family. The bulk comprises correspondence of the Rt. Hon. Thomas Spring Rice, 1st Baron Monteagle of Brandon (d. 1866) and his two sons, the Hon Stephen and the Hon. Charles Spring Rice. Monteagle was Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1835 to 1839 and Comptroller General from 1839 to 1865 and his sons served in the Board of Customs and the Foreign Office, respectively. The letters are varied in content and, in addition to the information they contain about the family itself, provide many valuable comments on political and economic events at home and abroad, as well as on the troubles in Ireland in the 1840s; Lord Monteagle's residence was at Mount Trenchard, co. Limerick. Included is a lengthy and interesting letter from Macaulay to Monteagle, written in August 1834 from India, dealing with party politics and parliamentary affairs. Some two hundred letters exchanged in the years 1873 to 1902 mainly between Cecil and Stephen Spring Rice (grandsons of Monteagle) and the latter's wife Julia also form part of the donation. Cecil Spring Rice was Ambassador in Washington from 1913 to 1918 and for the thirty years preceding held posts in America, Japan, Berlin, Persia and Russia. Extracts from certain items in this correspondence were printed in *The Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring Rice*, edited by Stephen Gwynn (2 vols., 1929).

SPRING RICE  
AND  
FITZGERALD  
CORRE-  
SPONDENCE

Mrs. Booth has also presented to the Library over 400 letters and papers (1805-80), together with newspaper cuttings and photographs, respecting Sir Peter Fitzgerald, 19th Knight of Kerry (father of Julia Spring Rice) and fifty letters (December 1870-September 1880) of his son Sir Maurice, written when the latter was equerry to Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught. Among the correspondents of the 19th Knight are A. P. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, various members of the peerage, notably Lord Lansdowne, and Lt.-Col. A. F. Pickard, also equerry to the Duke and assistant private secretary and assistant keeper of the Privy Purse to the Queen.

Ancillary biographical materials relating to her family have also been forwarded by Mrs. Booth. These, which should be of

great value to scholars working on the collection, are being preserved with the correspondence.

The Library has recently received on deposit the muniments of the Brooke family of Mere Old Hall, near Knutsford, co. Chester, which have been entrusted to our care by Col. R. P. Langford Brooke. This collection, which numbers over 2,000 items, dates from the thirteenth century to the twentieth and includes a wide range of documents, medieval deeds, estate records and papers, later muniments of title and correspondence. Among places most fully represented are Mere, Dutton, Stretton, Over Tabley, Plumley, Lostock Gralam, Holford, Walton and Bollington. The larger groupings relate to Stretton, Dutton, Walton and, of course, Mere itself, which was purchased in 1652 from John Mere and William his son by Peter Brooke, younger son of Thomas Brooke of Norton, co. Chester. Peter, who was Knighted in 1660 and became sheriff of Cheshire in 1669, also acquired the Over Walton estate from the Marbury family in 1657. A comparatively high proportion of the Cheshire records consists of thirteenth and fourteenth century charters and there are several interesting seals. Outside the county another large grouping comprises letters and documents dealing with the sale of Sir Peter Leicester's estates in Ireland in the 1750s, while a more unusual feature is a block of early nineteenth century papers respecting plantations in Antigua. The whole collection is one which both adds to the value and widens the range of the extensive collections available for research in the Library's Charter Rooms.

THE  
MUNIMENTS  
OF THE  
BROOKE  
FAMILY OF  
MERE, CO.  
CHESTER

Dr. F. Ll. Harrison of the Faculty of Music at Oxford has kindly contributed the following account of the *Benedicamus* melodies in Rylands Latin MS. 24:

"The Offices (Hours services) of the Latin rite conclude with the singing of the versicle *Benedicamus Domino* and the response *Deo gratias*. Both versicle and response are sung to the same melody, which varies with the service and the festal rank of the day, the

THE  
MELODIES  
FOR  
*BENEDICA-  
MUS DOMINO*  
IN RYLANDS  
LAT. MS. 24



more elaborate melodies being assigned to Vespers and Lauds on days of liturgical importance. In the course of researches into the music of the English medieval liturgies I have identified a number of these melodies and the sources from which they were drawn. The most important clue to the discovery of their sources was found in the series of *Benedicamus* melodies contained in Rylands Latin MS. 24 (fols. 14-14v), a thirteenth-century Gradual-Missal from Exeter diocese, perhaps from the cathedral. On the fly-leaf (fol. 1) of the manuscript is written in a thirteenth-century hand: 'Memoriale Henrici de Cicestria canonici Exon. prec. lx. s.' To the notes of Henry of Chichester in M. R. James's catalogue of the Latin manuscripts it may be added that his gifts to the cathedral included 'unum missale' (*Ordinale Exon.*, ed. J. N. Dalton, ii. 548).

"The Sarum Consuetudinary of the early thirteenth century has this direction concerning the music of the *Benedicamus* (*Use of Sarum*, ed. W. H. Frere, i. 254): 'In festis vero duplicibus et in festis quando Invitatorium a tribus canitur, dicitur aliquod proprium *Benedicamus* de historia festi de quo agitur vel aliquid aliud quod festo conveniat.' The latter alternative undoubtedly refers to the *Benedicamus* tropes (which included the ritual words) and the substitutes for the *Benedicamus* (which were free poems) found during this period in musical settings, either monophonic (melody only) or polyphonic (for two or three voices). The former alternative implies that the *Benedicamus* melodies for festivals were not original compositions, but were drawn from the existing responds of the feast.

"The references to the subject in the Lincoln Customary of the time of Richard de Gravesend (Bishop, 1258-79) give us more specific information on how the *Benedicamus* melodies were adapted from the music of the responds. At the end of first Vespers on feasts a polyphonic piece (*organizacio*), presumably a setting of a *Benedicamus* melody, trope or substitute, was performed by a few singers, and the response *Deo dicamus* (*gratias*) was sung 'eodem modo sicut *In perhenni seculorum tempore* in fine vi responsorii sancte trinitatis' (*Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, ed. H. Bradshaw and C. Wordsworth, i. 369). The sixth respond at Matins on Trinity Sunday is *Honor virtus*, and the words quoted

come at the end, set to an extended phrase of chant. Similarly the response to the *Benedicamus* at the end of Lauds on festivals was sung to the melody *flos filius ejus*, which was taken from the verse of the respond *Stirps Jesse* at Matins on the Nativity of the Virgin : ' Unde organizent vicarii sive pueri de choro dispositione succentoris et respondent regentes chorum cantando sicut canitur *flos filius* in fine versus qui vocatur *virga dei* ' (ibid. p. 373). The third *Benedicamus* melody mentioned in the Lincoln Customary is called *clementiam*, and comes from the respond *Qui cum audissent* at Matins of St. Nicholas : ' In secundis vesperis cantetur *Benedicamus* a regentibus chorum principalibus in loco ubi stant sicut canitur *clemenciam* in fine quinti Responsorii hystorie beati Nicholai ' (ibid. p. 381). The melody *flos filius* is well-known to musical historians through its occurrences as the tenor of polyphonic pieces, both as an extract from the respond *Stirps Jesse* and as a *Benedicamus* melody. Yvonne Rokseth pointed out (*Polyphonies du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, iv. 195) that its use for the *Benedicamus* was an instance of a general practice of deriving *Benedicamus* melodies from responds, and identified another *Benedicamus* chant as the *clementiam* melody. As far as I know, no other *Benedicamus* melody has been traced to its original source ; it would be difficult to do so without some clue to the feast from which it came or the words to which it was originally sung. It is fortunate, therefore, that fifteen of the seventeen *Benedicamus* melodies for festivals in Ryl. Latin MS. 24 show in red ink the words with which they were originally associated in a chant of the Office. My search for the occurrence of these word-cues in responds has been successful in all but one instance, which is marked *quem suscita*. Besides *in perenni*, *flos filius* and *clementiam* the series includes melodies drawn from chants sung on Trinity Sunday and on the feasts of the Assumption of the Virgin, St. Peter ad Vincula, St. Thomas of Canterbury and St. Laurence. Details will be given in my forthcoming book *Music in Medieval Britain*.

" The melodies in Ryl. Latin MS. 24 are not expressly assigned to their particular feasts, but are grouped together under the heading : ' In duplicibus festis et in festis cum triplici invitatorio dicitur unum istorum.' Some have an alternative ending with



*Alleluia*, for use during the Easter season. It would appear that in the first stage of their history the melodies were proper to their particular day, but that later a limited number was chosen for constant use, as at Lincoln, or a larger selection was given from which free choice could be made, as at Salisbury. A Sarum Ordinal of the late fourteenth century (Salisbury Cathedral Library, MS. 175, fols. 135, 173) has twelve melodies, without word-cues, to be sung 'pro dispositione clericorum'; there are six in common with the Exeter series. In some instances, however, a melody was assigned to a single feast. At Hereford the *Benedicamus* melody on the Purification, which does not appear in Sarum or Exeter, was taken from the beginning and end of the verse *Haec speciosum* of the respond *Videte miraculum* for that feast (*Missale Herefordensis*, ed. W. G. Henderson, p. 138). The Sarum *Benedicamus* on the Epiphany used the melody of the verse *Balaam de quo vaticinans* from the Epiphany sequence *Epiphaniam Domino canamus gloriosam* (*Missale Sarum*, ed. F. H. Dickinson, col. 85). The latter melody is in the Exeter set, without indication of its source.

"The part of an existing chant chosen for the *Benedicamus* was normally an extended passage on one or a few syllables; in medieval terminology such a passage was called a *neuma*. The practice has parallels in other ritual forms, such as the sequence, originally based on the final *neuma* (*jubilus*) of the *Alleluia*, the prose, originally a text applied to a *neuma* in a respond, and *Ite missa est* at the end of Mass, which in the Sarum rite was sung to the melody of the *Christe eleison* section of the troped *Kyrie* of the day. Among polyphonic forms based on a *neuma* the outstanding examples are the clausula, which arose c. 1200, and its successor the motet.

"In both musical and liturgical aspects the *Benedicamus* has considerable significance in the history of sacred polyphony. Polyphonic settings of *Benedicamus* melodies occur in the twelfth century, and it seems certain that the troped *Benedicamus* of that time was the direct ancestor of the liturgical conductus of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and that the function of the conductus was that of *Benedicamus* substitute. At the same time, the custom of composing polyphonic settings of the *Benedicamus*

melodies continued throughout the Middle Ages. By enabling us to identify a number of these melodies the Exeter manuscript throws further light on the medieval practice of taking plainsong *neumae* from their original contexts and turning them to new liturgical and musical uses, and also contributes to our understanding of the development of polyphonic music during a formative period of its history."

During the recent summer an exhibition, "The Book of Psalms in Writing and in Print", at the Gutenberg-Museum, Mainz, has marked the 500th anniversary THE MAINZ PSALTER, 1457 of an outstanding event in the history of the beginnings of printing. On 14 August 1457 appeared the first printed edition of the *Psalter*, in the colophon of which for the first time printers proudly put their names to their work and recorded the date of its completion. It is often loosely asserted that Mainz is named as the place of printing, but Sir Irvine Masson in his study *The Mainz Psalters and Canon Missae, 1457-1459*, published three years ago, has pointed out that this is not so. One printer, Johann Fust, is described as a citizen of Mainz, while the other, Peter Schoeffer, is stated to come from Gernsheim, but there is no indication in the colophon that the book was printed in Mainz, although the fact is not disputed. The *Psalter* is a magnificent folio volume, the largest copy examined by Sir Irvine (that of H.M. the Queen, at Windsor) measuring  $413/5 \times 293/304$  mm., and all the ten surviving copies are printed on vellum. It has the distinction of being the first book printed in three colours, the text in black and red, the ornamented initials, of which there are over 200, alternately in red and blue, the ornament in each case being in the converse colour. The majority are two-line initials, a few are four-line, while the only six-line initial is the magnificent B at the commencement of Ps. 1, which is familiar from frequent reproduction. There are two issues of the book—a longer issue of 175 leaves in which antiphonal matter of the use of the diocese of Mainz is printed in a type smaller than that employed for the Psalms, and a shorter issue of 143 leaves in which blank spaces have been left for the insertion in manuscript of antiphonal matter appropriate to the church in which each copy



was to be used. The Rylands copy, at one time in the possession of a Praemonstratensian house near Memmingen, is the only perfect copy of the shorter issue, and is at present on view in the Main Library as part of an exhibition of treasures from the Crawford and Spencer collections. A second Psalter was printed by Fust and Schoeffer in 1459 and one of the thirteen surviving copies is also to be found in the Library. This is not a new issue of the earlier Psalter, which was designed to be used in churches, but a completely new production, a monastic psalter for use in the Bursfeld Congregation, a house of the Benedictine Order.

The following is a list of the public lectures (the fifty-sixth series) which have been arranged for delivery in the Lecture Hall of the Library during the current session 1957-8, at 3 p.m. in the afternoon :

THE FIFTY-SIXTH SERIES  
OF RYLANDS  
PUBLIC  
LECTURES

16 October 1957. "King Arthur's Sword or The Making of a Medieval Romance." By E. Vinaver, Professor of French Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.

13 November 1957. "Martin Luther and Andrew Carlstadt." By E. G. Rupp, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Manchester.

11 December 1957. "The Conciliar Movement in Recent Study." By E. F. Jacob, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

15 January 1958. "Hermocrates and Fifth-Century Syracuse." By H. D. Westlake, Hulme Professor of Greek in the University of Manchester.

12 February 1958. "The Book of Job and its Meaning." By Harold H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.

12 March 1958. "Moral Sensibility in Goethe's Plays." By Ronald Peacock, Henry Simon Professor of German in the University of Manchester.

30 April 1958. "Religious Issues in Late Nineteenth-Century American Novels." By Wallace E. Davies, Associate Professor of History in the University of Pennsylvania.

The following is a list of recent Library Publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the latest issue of the BULLETIN (March 1957):

RECENT  
LIBRARY  
PUBLICATIONS

"The Work of a late Fifteenth-Century English Scribe, William Ebesham." By A. I. Doyle, Assistant Librarian, Durham University Library. 8vo, pp. 28, with six plates. Price three shillings net.

"Counter-Revolution in Brittany: The Royalist Conspiracy of the Marquis de la Rouërie, 1791-3." By A. Goodwin, Professor of Modern History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 30. Price three shillings net.

"The Military Papers of Colonel Samuel Bagshawe (1713-62)." By James Hayes. 8vo, pp. 34. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"The Litigation of an Exempt House, St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 1182-1237." By Eric John, Lecturer in History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 26. Price three shillings net.

"Booth's Rising of 1659." By J. R. Jones, Lecturer in Modern History, King's College, University of Durham. 8vo, pp. 28. Price three shillings net.

"The Collection for the Indians of New England, 1649-1660." By William Kellaway. 8vo, pp. 19. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

"Martyrs and Martyrdom." By T. W. Manson, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 22. Price three shillings net.

"A Contribution to the Archaeology of the Western Desert: IV." By Alan Rowe, Lecturer in Near Eastern Archaeology in the University of Manchester, and B. R. Rees, Senior Lecturer in Greek in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 36, with one plate. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"The Victorian Rembrandt: Carlyle's Portraits of his Contemporaries." By C. R. Sanders, Professor of English at Duke University, North Carolina. 8vo, pp. 37. Price three shillings and sixpence net.



Among gifts to the Department of Printed Books during the first half of 1957 attention may be drawn to one or two of particular interest. Dr. W. H. Chaloner has added to his many previous gifts a fine copy of Lavardin, *The History of George Castriot, surnamed Scanderbeg, King of Albania*. Newly translated out of French by Z. I. Gentleman, London, [R. Field] for W. Ponsonby, 1596, (S.T.C. 15318), while to Judge Neville Laski we are indebted for a set of the *Trial of major war criminals before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 1945-46, 1947-49*, 42 vols. Judge Laski had presented the set to the Inner Temple Library, but it had become surplus to their requirements, and at the Judge's request the Library authorities readily agreed to transfer it to this Library.

PRINTED  
BOOKS:  
GIFTS

Two handsome volumes, forming part of the series *Fontes Ambrosiani*, which consists of facsimiles or editions of material in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, have been presented to the Department by two separate donors. The first, *Cento tavole del codice Resta*, no. 29 of the series, was a gift from His Excellency the Italian Ambassador, Count Vittorio Zoppi, following on a visit he made to the Library in connection with the celebration of the Jubilee of the Manchester Dante Society. Count Sebastiano Resta, was born in Naples in 1635 and, in the *Cenacolo di Leonardo da Vinci* (*Analecta Ambrosiana III*, 72), he is described as "passionately devoted to the study and collection of works of art, and especially of drawings, of which he made several albums". One of these, comprising portraits of Kings and princes, he presented to King Philip V of Spain, another containing 248 drawings on 224 leaves he bequeathed to the Ambrosian Library. From the latter collection are selected the 100 leaves which are so finely reproduced, under the editorship of Signor Giorgio Fubini, by the Officine Grafiche Amilcare Pizzi at Milan. The paper sides of the binding of the facsimile reproduce the beautiful contemporary binding of the album. The second work, *De divina proportione* is an edition, by Signor G. Mardersteig, from one of the three surviving manuscripts of a work by Luca Pacioli, who was born in Borgo San Sepolcro about 1445, studied mathematics under Bragadino in Venice, and later taught the exact

sciences in most of the major cities of Italy. The manuscript contains sixty drawings of regular bodies which Pacioli asserts are the work of Leonardo da Vinci and these are reproduced in colour by Annibale Belli of Milan, the text being finely printed by the Officina Bodoni at Verona. In view of the great tradition of patronage of art and letters which has always existed in Italy it is interesting to note that the first work is published by the "*mecenatismo*" of the Credito Italiano, the second by that of the Mediolanica di Milano.

Since the last issue of the BULLETIN the following donors have made valuable gifts to the Library, and to them the Governors offer grateful thanks :

PRINTED  
BOOKS :  
GIFTS AND  
EXCHANGES

*Individual Donors*

- |                           |                               |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Dr. A. Adam.              | J. Morgenstern, Esq.          |
| Dr. Alexander Altmann.    | Conte Umberto Morra [3].      |
| Professor E. J. Arnould.  | The Rev. Father J. Morson,    |
| Sir Thomas D. Barlow.     | O.C.R.                        |
| Sir H. Idris Bell.        | Dr. Francis Neilson [2].      |
| The Rev. Dr. John Bowman. | The late Mr. Carl H. Pforz-   |
| J. A. Boyle, Esq.         | heimer.                       |
| Dr. Curt F. Bühler [5].   | Dr. Oskar K. Rabinowicz.      |
| Dr. W. H. Chaloner.       | Dr. E. I. J. Rosenthal.       |
| Dr. H. Dolu [2].          | The Rev. Professor H. H.      |
| Signor L. Donati.         | Rowley, D.D., F.B.A. [2].     |
| A. Eagle, Esq.            | W. H. W. Sabine, Esq.         |
| Miss N. E. Eardley [8].   | The Rev. Father A. Schneider. |
| Mrs. D. Harrison.         | S. R. Shapiro, Esq.           |
| R. E. Haslam, Esq. [2].   | Archibald Sparke, Esq., M.A.  |
| Dr. A. H. Hilli.          | W. Stechow, Esq.              |
| Dr. P. Kahle.             | The Rev. W. H. Thomson.       |
| J. B. Lee, Esq. [15].     | Professor Lynn Thorndike [2]. |
| Dr. H. Lehmann-Haupt.     | E. M. Trehern, Esq.           |
| W. B. Lockwood, Esq.      | The Right Rev. the Archbishop |
| Pfarrer D. Maldfeld [2].  | of Westminster.               |
| L. Marwick, Esq.          | The late Dr. A. P. Wadsworth. |



Mr. T. Wahbi [2].	Professor H. Wolter [2].
Mrs. Minnie Whiteside.	T. Worthington, Esq. [2].
Paul Winter, Esq.	

### *Institutions*

Amsterdam : Rijksmuseum [6].  
 Bangalore : Indian Institute of Culture.  
 Beaverbrook Newspapers Limited.  
 Beirut : American University Library [2].  
 Berlin : Staatliche Museen [6].  
 Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia.  
 Birmingham University Library.  
 Brescia : Ateneo [2].  
 British Academy.  
 British Museum, Trustees of the [6].  
 Brown University Library.  
 Bruxelles : Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie [3].  
 Bryn Mawr College.  
 Budapest : Musée Hongroise des Beaux-Arts [3].  
 Buddhist Society, London.  
 Cairo : Institut d'Égypte.  
 Canada : Public Archives.  
 Canberra : Commonwealth Library [2].  
 Carnegie United Kingdom Trust.  
 Cincinnati : Hebrew Union College.  
 Columbia University Libraries.  
 Columbus, Ohio : Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts.  
 Copenhagen : Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab [3].  
 Copenhagen University Library [5].  
 Dienstagsgesellschaft, Coburg.  
 Doubleday & Company Inc., New York.  
 Durham University Library.  
 Edinburgh University Library.  
 Friends of Canterbury Cathedral.  
 Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte.  
 Ghent University Library [3].  
 Glasgow University Library.

Gothenburg University Library [3].  
Göttingen : Akademie der Wissenschaften [21].  
Hague : Koninklijke Bibliotheek.  
Halle : Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek [2].  
Helsinki : Academia Scientiarum Fennica [7].  
Hertfordshire County Council : County Archivist.  
Honduras : Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores [2].  
Hoshiarpur : Panjab University Library [17].  
Ibadan : University College Library.  
Illinois University Library [4].  
India : National Archives [7].  
Iowa University Library.  
Ipswich and East Suffolk Record Office [2].  
Iraqi Embassy, London.  
Jewish Historical Society of England.  
Kansas University Library.  
Keats-Shelley Association.  
Lancashire County Council : County Record Office.  
Leiden University Library.  
Leigh & Johnson, Messrs., Solicitors, Manchester.  
Leningrad : Academy of Sciences [19].  
Liège University Library [6].  
Lima : Biblioteca Nacional de Peru.  
Limburgs Geschied- en Oudheidkundig Genootschap [2].  
Lincolnshire County Council : Archives Committee.  
Lisbon : Academia Portuguesa de Historia.  
Liverpool Public Libraries.  
London : Dr. Williams's Library [3].  
London : House of Lords : Clerk of the Parliaments [2].  
London : Inner Temple Library [42].  
London : Victoria & Albert Museum [4].  
Louvain University Library [4].  
Manchester Dante Society.  
Manchester Public Libraries [2].  
Manchester Statistical Society.  
Manchester University Press [4].  
Mendoza University Library [4].  
Michigan University Library [2].



Milan : Banca di Credito Finanziario.  
Minnesota University Library [3].  
Montpellier University Library [2].  
Moscow : Lenin State Library [2].  
National Archives (Scotland) [6].  
National Art Collections Fund [2].  
Neuchâtel University Library [7].  
New York : Pierpont Morgan Library.  
Nice : Centre Universitaire.  
Northampton, Mass. : Smith College Library.  
Oregon University Library.  
Oslo University Library.  
Philâdelphia : Franklin Institute.  
Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York.  
Pretoria : Staatsbiblioteek.  
Pretoria : University of South Africa [6].  
Rabat : Bibliothèque Générale et Archives du Protectorat.  
Rome : Instituto Español de Estudios Ecclesiasticos [3].  
Rome : Pontificium Athenaeum Lateranum.  
Saint Andrews University Library.  
Salamanca University Library.  
Saint Domingo University Library [10].  
Skira, Paris.  
Société Archéologique du Département de Constantine, Algeria.  
Société Historique Algérienne.  
Stanford University Library [3].  
Steenbrugge : Sint Pieters Abdij.  
Stockholm : Hallwylska Museet [13].  
Stockholm : Högskolas Humanistiska Biblioteket [12].  
Stockholm : Kungliga Biblioteket [3].  
Strasbourg University : Faculté des Lettres [5].  
Swedenborg Society, London.  
Thun : Historisches Museum Schloss Thun [2].  
Turin University Library [2].  
United States of America : National Archives.  
Uppsala University Library.  
Utrecht University Library [27].  
Vatican Library.

Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap " Ex Oriente Lux ".

Warsaw : Polska Akademia Nauk [3].

Washington : Library of Congress.

Washington : Smithsonian Institution [2].

Williamsburg : Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation [23].

Williamstown, Mass. : Williams College Libraries.

Yale University Library [2].

Zürich : Zentralbibliothek [31].

In addition to these donations many learned societies and other bodies have continued to present copies of their periodical publications.



# THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE EXCLUSION OF CHRISTIANS FROM THE SYNAGOGUES

KENNETH L. CARROLL, B.D., Ph.D.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN RELIGION, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY,  
DALLAS, TEXAS

## I

IN three places the Gospel of John speaks of Christians being excluded from the synagogues by the Jews. The word used, in each of these occasions, is ἀποσυνάγωγος which means "excluded from the sacred assemblies of the Israelites; excommunicated". This word, often translated as "put out of the synagogue", occurs only three times in the New Testament, with all three appearances being in the Fourth Gospel.

Jesus himself, in one place, is pictured as foretelling that his followers would be excluded from the synagogue: "They will exclude you from their synagogues; why, the time is coming when anyone who kills you will think he is doing religious service to God" (xvi. 2).<sup>1</sup> The other two appearances of the word are located a few chapters earlier. In ix. 22 there is found "His parents said this because they were afraid of the Jews, for the Jews had already made an agreement that if anyone acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, he should be excluded from the synagogues". The third occurrence is in xii. 42—"Yet for all that, even among the leading men, many came to believe in him, but on account of the Pharisees they would not acknowledge it, for fear of being excluded from the synagogues."

It is interesting that nowhere in the synoptic gospels is there found reference to such action on the part of the Jews. Why is it that John alone reports this development when the three earlier gospels apparently know nothing of it? The answer to this question can be found in the late date at which the Fourth Gospel was produced and in the fact that the author, whoever he may have

<sup>1</sup> All biblical quotations are from *The Complete Bible: An American Translation* (Chicago, 1939). The New Testament is translated by Edgar J. Goodspeed.

been, was a gentile. John, the latest of the gospels to appear, was written at the beginning of the second century. It was not until the last quarter of the first century that official Judaism really recognized the danger from Christianity. Then the Jewish leaders apparently felt the greatest challenge was from the *Minim*,<sup>1</sup> or Jewish Christians—the enemy within their midst. And so the bitterest assault upon these Jewish Christians took place from the turn of the first century to the middle of the second century.

## II

Judaism fought the *Minim*, i.e. the Jewish Christians, who were the enemy within her gate. Of the enemy outside, growing in power with every century, she apparently took no notice but “went on her own way, and on the line she chose for herself worked out her own salvation through centuries of noble and most tragic history. In like manner, though on other lines, Christianity went on its own way and forgot its Jewish origin.”<sup>2</sup> Among the people who had furnished the first disciples, and in the land of its birth, Christianity was represented by a dwindling and discredited sect, which claimed kinship with Jews and Christians and which was disowned by both.

*Minim* (sectaries) is a term used generally as a designation for Judeo-Christians.<sup>3</sup> These Jewish Christians characterized by the name *Minim* perhaps held a Christology similar to that of the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>4</sup> To a Jew, the *Minim* were false at heart but did not necessarily proclaim their apostasy. They were judged to be more dangerous because they were more secret. Since they did not withdraw from the community of Israel, they had to be cast out. This end was to be obtained by the various devices for the detection of the *Minim*—the Formula against the

<sup>1</sup> R. Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London, 1903), pp. 380-81. Harris Hirschberg, “Once Again—The Minim”, *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxvii (1948), 305 ff., holds that the term *Minim* denotes adherents of Pauline Christianity. This writer, after much study, concludes that the term *Minim* is used in the Mishnah and Talmud to identify Jewish Christians.

<sup>2</sup> Herford, op. cit. p. 397.

<sup>3</sup> See Hirschberg, op. cit. pp. 305-18.

<sup>4</sup> Herford, op. cit. pp. 380-1.



*Minim* and the references to liturgical and ritual variations, which are met in the Talmud and Mishnah.

Jerome speaks of the *Minim* out of his own personal knowledge. They are, he says, a sect of Jews claiming to be both Christians and Jews, but they are in fact neither. Since they are in all the Eastern synagogues they have to be detected by such devices as the "formula against the *Minim*".<sup>1</sup>

Herford ascerts that the *Minim* are "secretly unfaithful Jews, claiming to be Christians, but yet remaining in communion with Jews. Hence they were objects of suspicion and hatred to the Jews, while not acknowledged by the great body of non-Jewish Christians."<sup>2</sup>

The first official recognition of the existence of the *Minim* is the composition of the formula against them, known as the *Birchath ha-Minim*. This liturgical addition was introduced when R. Gamaliel II was president of the assembly at Jamnia. There were three factors which determined why the *Birchath ha-Minim* was produced at this specific time, around 90, and not earlier or later: first, the presidency of R. Gamaliel who ordered the formula; second, the death of Shemuel ha-Qaton, who composed it and lived at least a year afterwards; and, third, the destruction of the Temple and the desolation of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.<sup>3</sup> The first two factors are sufficient to fix the date approximately. The third is necessary to explain why a formula against the *Minim* was necessary.

The cessation of the Temple services and all connected with it was an event of profound significance to the Jewish Christians as well as to the Jews. While they appear to have formed a community to some extent separate from the Jews, the Jewish Christians appeared to take part in the ritual observances equally with the non-Christian Jews as long as the Temple remained. With the destruction of the Temple, the ceremonial law became a dead letter, and there was ground for a divergence of opinion as to the real meaning of that event and the lesson to be drawn from it.

The symbolic interpretation of the ceremonial law opened the way for a Christology more highly developed than that of the

<sup>1</sup> Jerome, Epistle 89 to Augustine. Quoted by Herford, op. cit. p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> Herford, op. cit. p. 378.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 382.

original Jewish Christians. Herford writes that the Epistle to the Hebrews, " whenever it may have been written and to whom-ever addressed, reflects the change by which the original Jewish Christians became the *Minim* ".<sup>1</sup> He feels that it is beyond question that there was a very close connection between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the *Minim*, who did not sever themselves from Judaism but claimed to be Jews no less than Christians.

The destruction of the Temple appeared to the rabbinical leaders as a punishment for the sins of the people. The Christians, going further, interpreted this as a " final departure of the sceptre from Israel ". The Law, then, was the only thing left as a basis for the continued existence of Israel. Had the Jewish Christians been the only members of the new faith it is quite possible that the breach between the two groups might have been healed, since the Jewish Christians also desired to observe the Law. However, says Parkes, the rabbis knew of the teaching of Paul and condemned it thoroughly. Thus it was only a step " from this condemnation to the refusal to accept as orthodox the conformity of the Jewish Christians ".<sup>2</sup>

### III

The *Birchath ha-Minim*, composed about A.D. 90 by Shemuel ha-Qaton, " represents the official condemnation by the Rabbis of the spurious Judaism which was growing in their midst, and at the same time furnished a means of detection ".<sup>3</sup> This declaration about heretics, which was inserted into the Blessings recited daily, was so worded that Jewish Christians could not repeat it. We can not be certain of the actual wording of the original malediction; later forms only contain the word *Minim* (heretics). According to Jerome, however, it contained the express condemnation of " Nazarenes ".<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-4.

<sup>2</sup> James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (London, 1934), p. 77.

<sup>3</sup> Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 384-5.

<sup>4</sup> Jerome, *On Isaiab*, v. 18. This is found in Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, xxiv. 87.



The purpose of this malediction was to make possible the detection of the *Minim* who would inevitably omit this particular paragraph when invited to pronounce the *Eighteen Benedictions* "The very fact that this addition was made to the synagogue service shows that the Jewish Christians were still frequenting the synagogue service, since it needed the introduction of the formula to detect them."<sup>1</sup> In other words, the Jewish Christians still regarded themselves as Jews at this time—no matter how much they disagreed with other Jews on the subject of whether or not the Messiah had already come.

By the end of the first century all of the synagogues of the diaspora had probably been informed of the new malediction and warned not to have any dealing with the Christians—through letters and emissaries sent out by the Jewish Patriarch of Palestine. Christians were to be excommunicated, and Jews were to avoid discussions of all kinds with the Christians.<sup>2</sup> Undoubtedly these letters contained a copy of the *Birchath ha-Minim* with instructions that it was to be included in the *Eighteen Benedictions*, for the daily cursing of Christians in the synagogues is very closely associated with these letters.<sup>3</sup> Jerome, Origen, and Justin all three "insist on the official character of these letters, and on their wide dispersion".<sup>4</sup>

At the time that Christianity and Judaism were parting company, faithful Jews were warned not to read the gospels. This shows that the Christian writings were sufficiently popular among Jewish readers to necessitate such a warning against perusing them.<sup>5</sup> This in turn illustrates how very Jewish the movement of Jesus was at this time. In the great dialogue between Justin Martyr, the Christian philosopher, and a party of Jews, the Jewish spokesman, Trypho, admits that he has studied the gospels.

In the Mishnah, compiled about A.D. 219 by Judas the Patriarch, there is found a passage where Akiba, the great sage

<sup>1</sup> Parkes, *op. cit.* pp. 384-5.

<sup>2</sup> Justin Martyr, *The Dialogue with Trypho* (New York, 1930), XXXVIII

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* XVI, XLVII, XCV, CXXXIII.

<sup>4</sup> Parkes, *op. cit.* p. 80.

<sup>5</sup> F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity* (New York, 1927), p. 60; Herford, *op. cit.* p. 90.

and saint, who was martyred by the Romans about 135 after having proclaimed Bar Cochba the Messiah, mentions "heretical" books :

All Israelites have a share in the world to come, for it is written, *Thy people also shall be all righteous, they that shall inherit the land for ever ; the branch of my planting, the work of my hands that I may be glorified.* And these are they that have no share in the world to come : he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead prescribed in the Law, and (he that says) that the Law is not from Heaven, and an Epicurean. R. Akiba says : Also he that reads the heretical books, or that utters a charm over a wound. . . .<sup>1</sup>

This term "heretical books" may point to just the extra-canonical apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of Judaism and the wild theories that some people drew from them. Ideas of the Messiah, of the Kingdom, and others which were of so much interest to the Christians, were developed there. One, 4 Maccabees, became popular in Syriac Christianity, and its seven martyred sons and their parents became "saints" of that church. This might be a ban to cut off from the Jews those works which the Christians had "ruined" or made doctrinally dangerous. These books were popular at this time with ordinary Jews, if not now. Would the rabbis attempt to change this ? Perhaps. In other cases it is seen that they did try to revise or reinterpret versus Christians even canonical books (the basis of Oral Law) which they could not cast out. Of course, the term may refer to Christian gospels, apocalypses, and epistles which had in them Jewish-sounding language and ideas.

The word "Epicurean" in this passage may point to the Christians. It does not, for the rabbis refer to the philosophical Epicurean of the Roman World. It had a bad sound to the Jews, probably from its sounding similar to the Hebrew *paḳar* ("to be unrestrained").<sup>2</sup> Christians, similar to Paul and the Fourth Gospel type, who gave up Jewish laws for "illumination", may be meant. How far some "libertine" Christians went can be seen by the attacks upon them in Jude.

The use of this passage quoted in *Sanhedrin* X, 1 from Isaiah (lx. 12) may be significant not only as a typical rabbinic "proof"

<sup>1</sup> *Sanhedrin* X, 1. All quotations from the Mishnah are from the English translation by Danby.

<sup>2</sup> Mishnah, p. 397, n. 4.

of resurrection or immortality but also as a *Jewish* reassertion of *their* claim to the Isaiah which Christians had been taking over. Isaiah had been used to prove Jesus the Messiah and Christians the chosen people. Acts xiii. 47 quotes Isaiah about Israel (for Christians this is the ecclesia, the "True Israel") and the "orders the Lord has given us". Obviously, in the Old Testament *Adonai* (Lord) is the pious way to avoid pronouncing the sacred יהוה. Of course, Christians seized this title, which was already a cult title for Serapis *et al.*, as generally referring to the Christ in the ecclesia. Thus did the Christians usurp the Jewish Scriptures and the Covenant with God. The rabbis were bound to react.

Another passage which apparently is aimed at the Christians is the following :

If a man said, " I will not go before the Ark in coloured raiment ", he may not even go before it in white raiment. (If he said), " I will not go before it in sandals ", he may not even go before it barefoot. If a man made his phylacteries round, it is a danger and is no fulfilling of the commandment. If he put them on his forehead or the palm of his hand, this is the way of heresy. If he overlaid them with gold or put them over his sleeve this is the way of the sectaries.<sup>1</sup>

The Jew was supposed to honour the Sabbath with his best (coloured) clothes. The "pure" Christian, however, would wear white and show humility by going barefoot in the Presence in the synagogue. These would, it seems, be Jewish Christians. Whenever a person in the synagogue got up to lead congregational prayers ("before the Ark"), after having made such statements as those quoted above, the rabbis decided he was shown to be unorthodox—and probably Christian. After all, no other group was so likely to get into the synagogue as the Christians. Jewish rabbis at an early date evidently gave this interpretation to this passage, for the Gemara remarks to this Mishnaic injunction that the reason for this is that such a one might belong to the Christians.<sup>2</sup>

Trying to use the ancient phylacteries in his own way or showily (like the gold crosses some still wear) was to be condemned. Either as magic or show it would be wrong. But here is a rabbinic law condemning this as heresy, not merely as ignorance or poor taste. It must point to a serious situation.

<sup>1</sup> *Megillah* IV, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Megillah* XXIV b.



When the early Christians took over as the “ecclesia of God”, they appropriated also the Hebrew Scriptures, synagogues, etc. Jewish Christians were, of course, at home in these. Some gentile Christians also, I feel sure, hoped to escape persecution by hiding within their “Judaism”—since the Romans tolerated Judaism itself. Therefore, to take over the phylacteries (along with any “magic” in them) was to take over something the Romans and Greeks recognized as sacred to the Jews.

It is important to note the quotation against the phylactery on the forehead—where they were supposed to be and were worn by custom. Someone the rabbis distrusted was using the phylactery in the right place for the “wrong” reason. Even if they had to change custom and make them worn elsewhere they would. To reinterpret the Biblical law on *totafof* or phylacteries where they were “frontlets between the eyes” was to face a problem like that suggested.<sup>1</sup>

Another Mishnah passage which is closely associated with the one just discussed reads as follows :

Greater stringency applies to (the observance of) the words of the Scribes than to (the observance of) the words of the (written) Law. If a man said, “There is no obligation to wear phylacteries” so that he transgresses the words of the Law, he is not culpable ; (but if he said), “There should be in them five partitions”, so that he adds to the words of the Scribes, he is culpable.<sup>2</sup>

This might be interpreted to mean that what is in the Bible should be clear to the sensible person if he is interested enough to check—no matter whether or not someone may try to fool him. However, it is easier to confuse a man about the Oral Law. Therefore, the guilt of causing a man to sin against rabbinic law rests upon the one who misrepresents it.

Phylacteries lie almost totally within the latter area, since the Bible tells of them and their wearing—but does not specify their size or contents. These were the growth of tradition. The customary “box” has four parts, each with a Biblical quotation in it. These cubes, on leather bands, were now, at this particular moment, worn high on the head and on the high inside of the left arm.

<sup>1</sup> See Deut. vi. 8 concerning the proper way to wear these phylacteries.

<sup>2</sup> *Sanhedrine* XI, 3.

The phylacteries (*tefillin* or *totafof*), if and when picked up by Christians, would normally start with the four partitions. The Christian addition would—if we judge by their scriptural exegesis—probably contain some Old Testament “prophecy” of the Messiah or a “saying” of the Lord or something about the Passion. All of these were important to the Christian faith. Jewish Christians may have started the fashion, but others would have taken it up.

It has been suggested by some scholars that the Decalogue was originally contained in the scriptural verses in the phylacteries. Thus it is proposed that the “fifth compartment” in the above passage would contain the Decalogue.<sup>1</sup>

Another curious example of the necessity which the Jews felt of protesting against the Christians is the following :

The inhabitants of Jericho were in the habit of repeating, each to himself, in a low voice, the words : “Blessed be the name of the glory of His Kingdom forever and ever” after the words “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord” had been recited aloud. But, says Rabbi Abbahu, it was enacted that these words should be repeated in a loud voice, on account of the troubles occasioned by the minim, but at Nehardea, where there are no minim, they repeat it to this day in a subdued voice.<sup>2</sup>

With the above passage from the Babylonian Talmud should be studied a related section from the Mishnah :

At the close of every Benediction in the Temple they used to say, “For everlasting”, but after the heretics had taught corruptly and said that there is but one world, it was ordained that they should say, “From everlasting to everlasting”. And it was ordained that a man should salute his fellow with (the use of) the Name (of God). . . .<sup>3</sup>

This may point to Christians of one school of thought—those who believed that they were already in God’s one age or eternity once they were in the ecclesia. This is the view of the ecclesia in the Gospel of John. Such a view would shut out non-members from the present enjoyment of eternity. This last emphasis upon eternity points to the word translated above as “world”. It is the Hebrew עולם, generally meaning “eternity” or “universe”. This helps support the view that this passage is versus the Christian doctrine of a churchly eternity, while the Jews held to the idea of a future entrance into eternity through resurrection.

<sup>1</sup> Hirschberg, op. cit. p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> *Pesachim* LVI a.

<sup>3</sup> *Beraḥoth* IX, 5.

The last sentence quoted is pregnant with meaning. Here the rabbis cast off the old taboo against using the sacred יהוה instead of the customary circumlocution יהוה or *kyrios*. Why? Was it because Christians had seized the word "Lord" to mean Jesus Christ? To get the pious Jew to speak the Name was to combat something like that.

Another Mishnah passage which illustrates the close connection of the Christians with the Jews says :

If a witness was not known (to the judges) another was sent with him to testify of him. Beforetime they used to admit evidence about the new moon from any man, but after the evil doings of the heretics they enacted that evidence should be admitted only from them that they knew.<sup>1</sup>

In the *Didache* the Christians are advised to set up fasts on days different from those of the Jews. They made Sunday their Sabbath. But in some places—notably Antioch and Palestine—Christians followed Jewish dating. Between East and West in the church of the second century a conflict arose over such things. This, coming to a crisis c. 190, was the famous "Quartodeciman Controversy". Rome, under Victor, decided that Easter should always end on a Sunday. He excommunicated the Asian bishops.

In the East Easter followed the Jewish dating of Passover. Jewish Christians kept the Jewish feasts, reading into them a Christian meaning and connecting with Passover and Pentecost the death of Jesus and the gift of the Holy Spirit. According to the Gospels, Jesus was crucified on a Friday and rose again on the Sunday following. Likewise the first Christian Pentecost was on a Sunday.

According to the Jewish custom the day of Passover (the fourteenth day of Nisan) might occur on any day of the week. It was only natural that the Jewish Christians would prefer that it should fall on a Friday, in order that the fast and feast days might correspond with those of the original Passion-week and the following Pentecost. Jewish Christians could give evidence as well as others, since it was the Jewish usage to fix the appearance of the new moon according to the evidence of eye-witnesses and thereby determine the days of the month.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Rosh Ha-Shanah* II, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Herford, op. cit. pp. 330-1.



The final passage to be discussed from the Mishnah appears to point towards the Christians' prayer and liturgy :

If a man said (in his prayer) : " To a bird's nest do thy mercies extend ", or " May thy name be remembered for the good (which thou hast wrought) ", or " We give thanks, we give thanks ", they put him in silence. If a man went before the Ark and fell into error, another must take his place : none may decline at such a time. Where does he begin ? At the beginning of the Benediction in which the other fell into error.<sup>1</sup>

The Jews, for all their ceremonial and social laws, have always been lacking in creedal theology. In these days it is likely that their *Shema* (Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21 ; Num. xv. 37-41), recited morning and night, served the purpose of creed or confession. Another portion of liturgy that has served as creed is the *Benedictions* (*Berakoth*), which form the chief part of the prayer-service (*Tefillah*). These blessings of the Name of a ruling God of Israel and the world were one of the most important parts of synagogue worship. These *Benedictions* and the *Shema* complement each other in the powers and mercies that they ascribe to God.

From the first century A.D. Christians have had the germ of all prayer and liturgy in the Lord's Prayer, behind which ancient tradition Matthew ascribes to Jesus himself. A good case for its verbal origin in the *Eighteen Benedictions* and the *Shema* can be made. The Lord's Prayer, as given to us, may be a definite prayer of Jesus or a Christian construction of a prayer on a well-known Jewish basis. In any case some connection between the Lord's Prayer and the *Benedictions* and *Shema* seems to be indicated. Certainly, Jewish leaders would recognize any similarity, and there would be bound to be reactions by the rabbis against the Christians. This mishnah on *Benedictions* may point to such a development. If any man in public prayer tampered with the order or language of the *Benedictions*, he would be suspected of heresy. Someone orthodox would have to replace him immediately to prevent the wrecking of the chief part of worship. Even a person's mistake in the prayer—or simplifying of it (as does the Lord's Prayer)—would seem doubtful. This was serious to real believers in the worship of one God where so many other peoples varied. Therefore great care was taken

<sup>1</sup> *Berakoth* V, 3. *Megillah* IV, 9 contains the same idea.

that the prayers contained not the least sign of Christian phraseology. The section here, "as thy mercies extend even to birds' nests" probably reminded them too much of Matt. x. 29.

With the influence of Christianity being felt more and more, the Jews changed another one of their ancient customs. In the Babylonian Talmud there is found, "And they read the Ten Words and the Shema. . . . Rab Jehudad said, and Shemuel said, In the provinces also they sought to read them, but they had already stopped them because of the murmuring of the heretics (*Minim*)."<sup>1</sup> It has been suggested that the recitation of the Decalogue, which formed part of the liturgical recitation of the *Shema*, was later discontinued for anti-Christian reasons.<sup>2</sup> It was perhaps feared that the Christians would thus be induced to believe that they, the Jews, were in a similar plight to themselves, and only pledged to the observance of the Ten Commandments (*i.e.* the moral law). It is very probable that the daily recitation of the Decalogue was omitted because it gave the *Minim* the opportunity to misrepresent the Jewish religion in order that their own "heretical" views might be set forth.

Paul's frontal attack on the Law had "led his anti-nomistic followers to a distinction between the Ten Commandments and the rest of the Pentateuch, accepting only the former as authentic which rejecting the legal parts of the books of Moses".<sup>3</sup> As has been stated in the discussion of the passages dealing with the use and form of phylacteries, it has been suggested that the Decalogue originally was contained in the scriptural verses and that this section would be in the "fifth compartment" mentioned in *Sanhedrin* XI, 3.

Although the *Birchath ha-Minim* appeared thirty or forty years before the events surrounding Bar Cochba, there is no direct information concerning any Jewish persecution of Christians from the time of James to the beginning of the revolt in the time of Trajan. It would appear that the relations between the *Minim* and the Jews were in all probability most hostile at the end

<sup>1</sup> *Berakoth* I h.

<sup>2</sup> W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 81-2.

<sup>3</sup> Hirschberg, *op. cit.* p. 307. See also Herford, *op. cit.* pp. 308-11.

of the first century and at the beginning of the second. Even at the close of the first century, when the *Minim* were officially condemned, "it was not evident to the Jews that the development of the Christian Church would proceed on Gentile lines, and would leave the *Minim*, i.e., the Jewish Christians, behind".<sup>1</sup> Of Gentile Christianity, the rabbinical literature scarcely takes any notice—"for there was obviously less danger to Judaism from a mainly Gentile Christianity than from a Jewish form of it connected at so many points with pure Judaism."<sup>2</sup>

## IV

It is generally agreed that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a gentile. His method of writing was that of the Greeks rather than that of the Jews. He was not giving a verbatim report; rather, he was putting "into the mouth of the speaker not the *ipsissima verba* spoken on a given occasion, but the sentiments which seemed to the writer to be proper on the occasion".<sup>3</sup> Such an attitude makes it very easy for the writer of the Fourth Gospel, doing his work in A.D. 100-110, to read back the "excluding" of Christians from the synagogues of his day to the very time of Jesus.

Starting in the last quarter of the first century, as we have seen, there was this forceful attempt on the part of the Jews to rid their synagogues of Christians. This is the Jewish policy toward

<sup>1</sup> Herford, *op. cit.* p. 393.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (New York, 1928), p. xxiii. He continues: "John's practice indeed is not unlike that of Thucydides, who in a famous passage (i. 22) frankly admits that this is his method. But we have a better parallel still in Plato who, admitting that he owed his inspiration to the teaching of Socrates, never claims to reproduce the *ipsissima verba* of his Master, but rather puts into the mouth of Socrates philosophical theories which, though in germ Socratic, are in their full development, those of Plato himself. As in the Platonic Dialogues the speeches of Socrates owe not only style and language but also most of their matter to Plato himself, so in the case of the Fourth Gospel" (pp. xxiii-xxiv). See also (p. xxiv): "Indeed so little careful is the author to distinguish between his own thoughts and those he puts in the mouths of his characters, that it is sometimes impossible to tell where the speech he is reporting ends and his own comment upon it begins."



Christians which the author of the Gospel of John<sup>1</sup> knows—a measure which operated well into the last half of the second century. It is this late development which is in John's mind as he writes his gospel. He has projected this attitude and action, in reality much later than the time of Jesus, back into the period of Christian beginnings—even having Jesus himself predict the Jewish exclusion of Christians from the synagogues.

<sup>1</sup> All three of the synoptic gospels were, it appears, already in existence by the time the *Birchath ha-Minim* was produced.

# MARY RUSSELL MITFORD: THE INAUGURATION OF A LITERARY CAREER

By W. A. COLES, M.A., Ph.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN ENGLISH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

MARY RUSSELL MITFORD'S reputation, seemingly secure, if modest, rests primarily upon her prose sketches of country life, particularly the five series collected under the title, *Our Village*, and upon the several volumes of her published correspondence.<sup>1</sup> Yet she herself at first placed no great weight upon her efforts at prose, and, in point of fact, came almost unawares upon her *métier*. It is now possible to follow and to reconstruct in some detail the beginnings of her career as a writer principally through the medium of her laconic, if informative, diary,<sup>2</sup> and her as yet unpublished correspondence with Thomas Noon Talfourd, who was for about twenty years her literary adviser, friend, helper, and confidant.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The three chief collections are: *The Life of Mary Russell Mitford, Related in a Selection from Her Letters to Her Friends*, ed. Rev. Arthur Guy L'Estrange, 3 vols. (London, 1870); *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford, Second Series*, ed. Henry Chorley, 2 vols. (London, 1872); and *The Friendships of Mary Russell Mitford as Recorded in Letters from Her Literary Correspondents*, ed. Rev. Arthur Guy L'Estrange, 2 vols. (London, 1882).

<sup>2</sup> Miss Mitford used as a diary the 1819 edition of the *Literary Pocket-Book*, edited by Leigh Hunt and printed by C. and J. Ollier. She crammed her entries onto pages allotted for notes, and then onto blank pages and printed pages, so that her writing is at times very difficult to decipher. The volume is now in the British Museum. The diary runs from 1 January 1819 to 11 March 1823.

<sup>3</sup> The correspondence exists primarily in three large batches. The largest, about 275 letters and fragments, almost entirely from Miss Mitford to Talfourd, is contained in two quarto volumes owned by the Harvard University Library. The John Rylands Library has three quarto volumes which contain about 180 letters and fragments. One third of these are from Talfourd to Miss Mitford, and the rest from her to him. There are also in the Bodleian Library about eighty-three letters and fragments from Miss Mitford to Talfourd. To these may be added a few other scattered letters. The letters in all of the collections are closely related, and often a fragment in one library is continued in a fragment in another. Almost none of them has ever been reproduced in print, and, as far as I know, only the letters in the John Rylands Library have ever been used before by students (Miss Vera Watson drew on them for her biography, *Mary Russell Mitford*

By 1820 the Mitford family fortunes must have been at, or very close to, ebb tide. Her father, Dr. George Mitford had by then successively consumed whatever money he himself had inherited, his wife's considerable fortune of £28,000 in addition to houses and landed property (with the exception of about £3,000 which was in trust, but mortgaged for income), and the £20,000 in prize money which he had won from a sweepstakes ticket chosen by his daughter, Mary. In April of that year the family finally moved from their country estate, Bertram House, to a small rented cottage at Three Mile Cross, a mile away and three miles from Reading. Miss Mitford already must have been considering the prospect (which she voiced despairingly to Talfourd the following year)<sup>1</sup> of leaving her family and becoming a schoolteacher or a governess. Her only other alternative was to achieve success in, or what was more to the point, to make money at, writing. For this work she was not wholly unprepared, for as a young woman, ten years earlier, she had published several volumes of verse,<sup>2</sup> and she was always a voracious and cultivated reader. Whatever thought she may have given to this plan was certainly spurred at the end of 1820. For on 6 December she saw Macready perform in C. E. Walker's play, *Wallace*, at Covent Garden, and learned that the play, which was by no means first-class, had earned its young and unknown author several hundred pounds. Miss Mitford decided to see what a similar attempt might yield her, and in this resolve she was probably encouraged by her young friend Thomas Talfourd, whom she saw in London on the following day.

(London, 1949), but she quotes only a few sentences in all). The dimensions and value of the correspondence, therefore, have not yet been recognized. I have edited the letters of the first five years in an unpublished Harvard University thesis "The Correspondence of Mary Russell Mitford and Thomas Noon Talfourd (1821-1825)" (1956), and I am now editing the rest. I give the location of each letter quoted in the text of this article in a parenthesis following the passage. *H* designates the Harvard University Library and *R* the John Rylands Library.

<sup>1</sup> In a letter of 16 December 1821, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>2</sup> *Miscellaneous Poems* (1810), and a second edition the following year with twenty-three additional poems; *Christina, the Maid of the South Seas* (1811); *Watlington Hill* (1812), and *Narrative Poems on the Female Character* (1813). At that time she was also publishing verse in R. H. Davenport's *Poetical Register* (vols. vii and viii (1812 and 1814)).



Miss Mitford had met Talfourd, who was then almost twenty-six, and about seven years her junior, several years earlier in Reading, where he was born, and where he had been a prize pupil of Dr. Richard Valpy, the headmaster of Reading School. After leaving school Talfourd had gone to London to study for the bar, and on a side had begun his own active literary career. By 1820 he had published a large variety of verse, reviews, and articles, ranging from Greek to contemporary literature, politics, and law, and had become an active champion of the Romantic writers. His early friendship with Charles Lamb led him on to intimacy with Wordsworth, and his circle of friends soon included Coleridge, Hazlitt, and other leading figures of the literary and theatrical worlds. In 1820 Talfourd was particularly well situated to help Miss Mitford in her career since in that year he began his long association with the *New Monthly Magazine*, for which he wrote the regular dramatic reviews and occasional essays. Also in the same year he was introduced by Lamb to John Scott, the editor of the *London Magazine*, and he began to contribute articles there. After the death of Scott he was even offered the editorship of the magazine, but he had to refuse it because he felt the duties would not be compatible with his profession.<sup>1</sup> In spite of his youth, therefore, he had wide connections in periodical circles, and through his reviewing he became familiar with the playwrights, actors, and managers of the London theatres.

Miss Mitford's early literary hopes were concentrated entirely upon the drama, for success there could have meant financial ease. The prayer that she records in her diary on 20 December, the day she began her first play, *Fiesco*, echoes throughout her career: "God grant I may make money of it." She apparently began her correspondence with Talfourd in January of 1821, while she was working on the play. From him she received suggestions for alterations, and she benefited from his knowledgeable advice on stage effect, dramatic construction, and, most important of all,

<sup>1</sup> Miss Mitford alludes to Talfourd's refusal in a letter of 25, 26 May 1821, in the Harvard University Library. Miss Vera Watson confirmed my earlier conjecture of the fact in her article, "Thomas Noon Talfourd and His Friends—I", *TLS* (20 April 1956), p. 244.

the requirements of individual actors in a star-crossed theatre. She was writing at first wholly for the actor William Macready, to whom Talfourd sent her plays for presentation to the managers of Covent Garden, and though she was acutely conscious of her defects and inadequacies as a dramatist, her mood at first was enthusiastic and optimistic. On 24 March she writes to Talfourd: "I am quite prepared for rejection—which Mr. Macready, though he has caught some of your infectious good will, seems himself to anticipate. Nevertheless I shall go on. You have inspired me with the hope that I may sometime or other produce something worthy even of his powers & I have set before my eyes the example of Mr. Tobin who after eleven rejected Dramas wrote the *Honeymoon*.<sup>1</sup> I will write a good Tragedy, even if I first write eleven bad ones. On this I am determined" (H).

It did not take eleven separate rejections to sour Miss Mitford's mood: four acceptances accomplished that. By the end of 1825 she had written *Foscari*, *Julian*, *Rienzi*, and *Charles the First*, and had seen all accepted at the two major theatres. But during that period only one, *Julian*, was brought to the stage,<sup>2</sup> and for this she received only £200, since its run was cut off just short of the ninth night so as to avoid payment of a third £100. The rest were written and revised, and revised again, laboured upon and fretted over, urged on by the theatres, and then stalled and put aside, because of the bickerings, rivalries, jealousies, and debts of the actors and managers, or, in the case of *Charles*, the ban of the licenser. Letter after letter tells the story in frequently deadening detail, and recurring passages of pathos and anguish alone redeem and dignify what might otherwise be read as burlesque or Grub Street farce. From the letters emerges an unsurpassed picture of the theatrical conditions under which the old drama finally toppled, and they also remind us that the dark night of the soul is not restricted to the major writer alone.

<sup>1</sup> John Tobin (1770-1804), dramatist. All his works were posthumously produced. *The Honey Moon* was accepted at Drury Lane before his death and performed on 31 January 1805. It was very successful and remained a favourite for twenty years.

<sup>2</sup> It was first performed at Covent Garden on 15 March 1823.

*Foscari*, *Charles the First*, and *Rienzi* were eventually performed,<sup>1</sup> and the latter play was even a very considerable success, but they never really repaid Miss Mitford for the time and emotional energy that she lavished upon them. Furthermore three later plays, *Gaston de Blondville*, *Otto of Wittlesbach*, and *Inez de Castro* never even reached the stage. The descrescendo of Miss Mitford's hopes for financial security from the drama is apparent in a letter that she writes to Talfourd on 4 December 1825: "I am really so worn down by fruitless exertion, so heartsick with perpetual anxiety & constant disappointment that it would be a relief & a comfort to me to escape from these hopeless efforts into some straight forward path however rugged. Gladly & joyfully should I see all that remains gathered together & sunk in an annuity on their<sup>2</sup> joint lives, whilst I went out to take my chance in the world—and this is no romantic expression—but the real & simple language of my feelings—Of this however neither will hear—But it will & must be the end" (R).

It probably would have been the end, were not a counter-strain of possibilities steadily, if at times uncertainly, rising. In a letter earlier in the year, on 7 October, Miss Mitford voices the same despair, but suggests an alternative course: "I . . . can only lament the trouble & pain which these theatrical affairs give *you*—I deserve disappointment for having against all warning clung to the Drama instead of trying the more laborious but more certain path of the Novelwriter" (R). She goes on, however, to explain why she feared fiction, even though such friends as the poet Henry Hart Milman and the publishers, Longman's, had strongly urged her to attempt it: "The excuse which I have always made to myself has been a persuasion that my talent, such as it is, . . . is essentially dramatic & that I am not likely to succeed in narrative." Also in an earlier letter she had told Talfourd that her "talent poor as it is" seemed to her "very mannered & limited".<sup>3</sup> What she seemed to fear most was her ability to construct a plot, invent situation, and carry forward

<sup>1</sup> In 1826, 1834, and 1828, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Her parents'.

<sup>3</sup> In a letter of 11 (?) July 1824, in the Harvard University Library.



continued action. This was her problem in dramatic composition too, for she always relied on friends to construct her plots, or took them from history, biography, and the like. Moreover, she had a very high opinion of the novel, and measured worth by the loftiest standards. On 13 (?) April 1823, she asked Talfourd if she should try a novel, and then gave her own negative answer : " But then a good Novel is so very great a thing—a Novel like Miss Austen's—a tragedy is nothing to it <sup>1</sup>—I never should be able " (*H*). And again on 23 September 1824, she writes, " After all, unless I could write a really good & *characteristic* novel (that to me is the charm of Miss Austen—) unless I could produce some thing above the common run in that department (of which I have great doubts) I had better stick to the Drama, where there are fewer competitors, & those few not extremely alarming " (*H*). What she thought of the " common run " of fiction is apparent in a letter of 29 July 1825 : " I shall be driven to spinning out wretched trash of novels—I know it—& I know how utterly contemptible they will be—& how completely I shall sink to the level of the Minerva Press " (*R*).

Miss Mitford's reservations about her abilities as a novelist were apparently sound ; she was spared the fiction mills. The one novel that she wrote, *Atherton*, was conceived in 1825, contracted for in 1836, and finally published in 1854, the year before her death. That was not a profitable pace for craftsmanship. But prose was nevertheless her real province of work. Miss Mitford saw Talfourd in Reading and at Three Mile Cross at the beginning of March 1821, soon after she had finished *Fiesco*. He probably then suggested to her that she begin writing poems and prose pieces for periodicals, and he offered to transmit them for her to the editors of the *New Monthly* and the *London* magazines. She quickly sent off some sonnets and a poem, and even suggested that she begin some dramatic scenes, but she was fearful about her prose. On 16 March she writes : " Ah, my dear Mr. Talfourd, I shall never make any thing of prose ! Do you think I shall ? I know as much about it as poor Mr. Jourdain who was so astonished to find he had been talking prose all his

<sup>1</sup> She is clearly thinking only of the sort of tragedy she and her contemporaries wrote.

life.<sup>1</sup> And I am equally provoked & ashamed to feel myself so incapable of expressing my own notions. The real truth is I believe that I have been for many years a most egregious letter-writer, & have accustomed myself to an incorrect & gossiping rapidity which does very well in writing to indulgent friends but will by no means suit that tremendous Correspondent the Public—so that in addressing that high personage I am frightened out of my wits—ponder over every phrase, disjoint every sentence, & finish by producing such marvellous lumps of awkwardness as those which I have the honour to send you. Will they be accepted do you think? I promise to improve, for on that I am resolved, cost what it may ” (H).

The “marvellous lumps of awkwardness” that she enclosed were her first prose sketch, “Field Flowers”, and an article “On the Comedies of Thomas May”. Both were printed in the *New Monthly Magazine*<sup>2</sup> and are here for the first time identified as hers. Soon afterwards she sent Talfourd two other sketches, “Richmond” and “On Letters and Letter-Writers”, both of which were also published in the *New Monthly*.<sup>3</sup> But she had not yet arrived at the idea of a sketch of village life, and when she did, she was characteristically uncertain of her accomplishment and afraid of the subject matter. On 8 June she sent Talfourd the sketch entitled “Our Village”, which she had written between 27 May and 5 June, and she writes in the letter which accompanied the packet: “The enclosure of this (p)acket<sup>4</sup> is more bad prose—I have great qualms of conscience about that too—because it is true almost to the letter—only as I have posted it in Yorkshire & I don’t think there is a soul in Three Mile Cross who knows what a magazine looks like I should hope it might pass unsuspected. But if you think it at all improper, or liable even by possibility to hurt any one’s feelings pray send it back to me ” (H). Talfourd, however, was quick to recognize the value of the piece and must have written back enthusiastically, for on 21 June, Miss Mitford

<sup>1</sup> The title character of Molière’s *Le bourgeois gentilhomme*; see Act II, scene iv.

<sup>2</sup> In i (1821), 648-50, and ii (1821), 70-5, respectively.

<sup>3</sup> In ii (1821), 56-9, and ii (1821), 142-6, respectively.

<sup>4</sup> Parentheses enclose letters added by the editor to fill in tears in the manuscript.

writes : " What you say of ' Our Village ' is exceedingly encouraging & comfortable—I had looked on prose composition as a thing not difficult merely, but impossible—I shall now take heart " (R).

But Talfourd was a keener judge than Thomas Campbell, the editor of the *New Monthly*, for the latter certainly must have seen this sketch and two others, " Boarding School Recollections. No. I. The French Teacher ",<sup>1</sup> and, " Lucy ", on the basis of which Talfourd was trying unsuccessfully until at least late July 1822, to negotiate for a series of prose sketches. It has been maintained incorrectly that Campbell saw *all* of the first series of *Our Village* sketches and refused them.<sup>2</sup> It is, of course, unlikely that Miss Mitford would have written *all* without hope of publication. But it is quite true that he saw the first few and rejected the idea of a series. Furthermore Campbell persisted in his obtuseness ; for in 1824,<sup>3</sup> after the first volume of *Our Village* was published, Miss Mitford sent him, through her friend, William Harness,<sup>4</sup> two other sketches " The Touchy Lady ", and " Rosedale and Its Tenants ",<sup>5</sup> and again tried, and again without success, to negotiate for a series of " country Articles ", " letter fashion or journal wise with new scenery & new people ". But Campbell's was not to be the final word. On 8 January 1823, after he had arranged for the publication of the series in the *Lady's Magazine*, and the sketch " Our Village " had appeared in the 31 December 1822, issue,<sup>6</sup> Talfourd wrote gloatingly to Miss Mitford : " Charles Lamb is quite enchanted with ' Our

<sup>1</sup> Later published in the second series of *Our Village* (1826) as " Early Recollections : The French Teacher ".

<sup>2</sup> See Vera Watson, *Mary Russell Mitford* (London, 1949), pp. 141-3, for a discussion and rejection of such contentions. However, as Miss Watson had not seen the Harvard letters she was unable to give full and precise information about the early history of the sketches.

<sup>3</sup> She mentions sending a sketch to Campbell in a letter of 4 September, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>4</sup> (1790-1869), divine and author, later her literary executor. He edited the *Life of Mary Russell Mitford* (see p. 33, n. 1), which was completed and published after his death by his curate, the Rev. Arthur Guy L'Estrange.

<sup>5</sup> They were printed in the *New Monthly Magazine*, xi (1824), 348-51, and xi (1824), 521-8, respectively. The former was later reprinted in *Our Village*, 2nd ser. (1826), and the latter was revised and reprinted as " Rosedale " in *Our Village*, 4th ser. (1830).

<sup>6</sup> iii. 645-50.



Village'—nothing so fresh and characteristic has, he says, appeared for a long time. Everyone who has read it thinks with him, & I enjoy telling everybody that Campbell declined it."<sup>1</sup>

Talfourd tried unsuccessfully to sell the sketches during the rest of 1821, while Miss Mitford attended solely to the drama. Near the end of the year, on 27 December, he wrote: "I still hope something may be done by way of moving the Editors to attention; but I would not have you write any more fugitive pieces till these are disposed of" (R). By the middle of 1822 Talfourd had definitely given up hope of publication in the *New Monthly*, and, indeed, was having troubles in that quarter himself. He writes to Miss Mitford<sup>2</sup> that Campbell had "almost shut the door . . . against merely critical articles", and for a time at least seemed to be considering doing without his services entirely. Yet his own difficulties indirectly benefited Miss Mitford, for Talfourd had married on 31 August and needed steady literary employment to eke out his as yet modest income from the law. Therefore quite surreptitiously, for fear of the ignominy of publishing in so insignificant a periodical, he engaged to write articles and reviews in the *Lady's Magazine*, and he also arranged for Miss Mitford to do a series of sketches there, beginning in the 30 September issue of the magazine.

Miss Mitford at first had no thought of collecting her sketches. She first voices the idea in a letter of 13 (?) April 1823, when, after the production of *Julian*, she was afraid to begin another play and was momentarily looking around for something else to do: "Would a Volume of Dramatic Scenes and sonnets . . . answer do you think? Or a Vol. of prose—some of the best things in Mr. Hamilton's<sup>3</sup>—I mean of my best—& others of the same sort with as much Dutch picture finishing as possible? I think that would—but then Mr. Hamilton having bought the Articles I suppose the right to them is in him now" (H). On

<sup>1</sup> The passage, from a letter of 8 January 1823, in a recently discovered collection of Talfourd material which I have not yet seen, is quoted by Vera Watson in "Thomas Noon Talfourd and His Friends—II", *TLS*, 27 April 1956, p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> In a letter dated 16 July 1822, which I have not yet seen. The passage is quoted by Vera Watson in the article cited in the preceding note.

<sup>3</sup> The *Lady's Magazine*, edited by S. Hamilton. His career is quite obscure. Miss Mitford's diary gives his address as 30 Judd Street, Brunswick Square.

the matter of copyright, however, Miss Mitford's misfortunes eventually worked to her gain. During the same month Hamilton, the editor of the magazine, absconded, owing her between thirty and forty guineas, and for the moment the periodical seemed likely to halt. The threat that her regular if quite modest income from this source might stop was for Miss Mitford more serious than the loss of money. She tells Talfourd on 24 April: "I should like to get as much as I could of course,<sup>1</sup> but my prime wish is that the thing might go on—I should like constant employment there or else where—for I begin not to dislike that sort of writing, & as to the stage I am heartsick at the very thought. . . . That Magazine did seem something certain—but there is nothing sure in this world but disappointment" (H).

The magazine did continue. It was taken over by Charles Heath,<sup>2</sup> Hamilton's brother-in-law, who refused to make up the contributors' losses, but promised to pay for all future articles, and, by way of compensation, to give permission to print articles published in the magazine. To Miss Mitford the arrangement seemed like a swindle contrived by the family, and at first she paid little attention to the concession. On 16 May she related the news to Talfourd and asked for his opinion: "Do you think the permission to print the papers worth any thing? Certainly Lucy, Hannah, *Our Village* & one or two more would with some new Articles make a pretty Volume<sup>3</sup>—& if that could be done I might go on quietly under the new arrangement—perhaps George Whittaker<sup>4</sup> would give me the price of my debt<sup>5</sup> for the Volume—But Mrs. Hofland<sup>6</sup> put that in for a pacifier, conscious poor dear woman that she had gone far beyond her powers in the treaty with Mr. Heath" (H).

Miss Mitford bowed to the new terms and later even accepted a reduction in her rate of payment. She could not afford to cut

<sup>1</sup> Of the money owed her.

<sup>2</sup> (1785-1848), engraver.

<sup>3</sup> Actually the first series of *Our Village* contained twenty-four sketches.

<sup>4</sup> (1793-1847), bookseller and publisher.

<sup>5</sup> The allusion is either to a specific debt to Whittaker, or to her general indebtedness, which she had hoped in vain that the profits from *Julian* would cover.

<sup>6</sup> Barbara Hofland (1770-1844), novelist, Miss Mitford's friend and fellow-contributor to the magazine.

herself off from what was then her sole source of income. But she began to arrange definitely for the publication of a prose volume. Once again bad luck came to her assistance. On 3 July she writes to Talfourd that George Whittaker will print the volume, but only on terms of a division of profit.<sup>1</sup> Fearing that sales would be slight, and anxious for any assured money, she wanted an outright sale, however small the price. But in a letter of 18 (?) January 1824, she tells Talfourd that she will accept Whittaker's terms "rather than not get out the Volume, in the hope that if it took at all it might be the means of procuring for me some employment in that line" (R). Though Miss Mitford's royalties on the first edition of the volume were lamentably small, a mere £20,<sup>2</sup> she profited eventually, for within four months of publication the first edition of 750 copies was sold out, and a new edition was printing; and by April of 1825, the book was in its third edition.

Miss Mitford first thought of calling her volume "Walks in the Country & sketches of rural character".<sup>3</sup> However, in a letter of 9 April 1824, she tells Talfourd that "'Our Village' is printing". "It will be a pretty little book", she says, "about the size & type of a Vol of the Scotch novels. I wonder whether it will gain me employment—which has been my object in the bringing it out—Really I see worse writing in the great Magazines—Many articles much better of course—but still some that are worse" (H). The precise date of the publication of *Our Village* has been the subject of imprecise speculation, which Miss Mitford's correspondence with Talfourd now clarifies. On Thursday, 6 May, she writes Talfourd that although the volume was "announced for last Saturday", she has heard nothing of it. On 12 May she writes again that she supposes the book is not yet published, but on 5 June she says that she has heard a fortnight ago that it was selling well.<sup>4</sup> This would suggest that the volume appeared during the third week of May. It is advertised in the

<sup>1</sup> The letter is in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>2</sup> She tells this to Talfourd in a letter of 23-26 September 1824, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>3</sup> She mentions the title in a letter of 29 October 1823, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>4</sup> The three letters are in the Harvard University Library.



*Morning Chronicle*, as "Published This Day", on 17 May, which was probably the actual day of publication.

The publication of *Our Village* brought Miss Mitford's connection with the *Lady's Magazine* to a conclusion. Jealous of the success of the volume, Heath and the publishers wanted to print on their own sketches in the magazine which Miss Mitford had not reprinted, and they also wanted to retain copyright on all future pieces. On 5 June 1824, she complains to Talfourd: "I have now to ask your advice what I should do with regard to writing for them in future—Their terms are six guineas a sheet, of very small print in double columns—little enough God knows—yet if I might reserve the right of copy for this I should not so much care—but it is clear that whilst offending & neglecting & beating me down they yet think well enough of the articles to desire to publish them in a Volume on their own account—Now this I should particularly dislike—I have selected the best for my own Volume—& of those that remain there are several that I should dislike exceedingly to be printed with my name—because there is a mixture of pungency, which in an obscure magazine where the author is unknown can hurt no one, but which when the writer is avowed would assume quite a different character, & probably be assigned to people whom I never dreamt of—Nevertheless it is throwing myself out of all employment to give them up—& that I hardly dare do. What would you advise?" (H). Talfourd told her to refuse to go on without copyright,<sup>1</sup> and on 4 September she writes again: "Mr. Heath will not hear of any future publication of articles written for him—an offer which I had made some months back—& so unless nobody will have me, & George Whittaker refuses the Second Vol<sup>2</sup>—why I have done with Mr. Heath. By the way Robinson<sup>3</sup>, who is very desirous to retain me, begs me to send them what I do not mean to publish myself—but your opinion of the discredit attached to writing for that trumpery work is decisive. I have entered a strong protest against their reprinting any of my articles on their

<sup>1</sup> She mentions this in a letter of 11 (?) July 1824, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>2</sup> Of *Our Village* sketches.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Robinson of Chapter House Court, St. Paul's Churchyard, publisher of the magazine.

own account—a thing I could by no means endure" (H). So the matter ended; however, in after years Miss Mitford lost her fears about the nature of her subject matter, for all the *Lady's Magazine* sketches were eventually reprinted in the *Our Village* series.

The reviews of *Our Village* were invariably kind. In her letter of 5 June Miss Mitford describes the reaction of the literary press and of her friends: "the Literary Newspapers (a thousand thanks for the Examiner by the bye—I recognized your kind hand without & within)<sup>1</sup>—the Literary papers speak favourably of it—especially the Somerset House Gazette<sup>2</sup> which is as kind as if you had written it—— . . . Mr. Macready condescends to be pleased—and Mr. Haydon causes the book to be read to his sitters to keep them in a good expression—Is not that a compliment?" (H). And though at first she complained that the book was not noticed by the great reviews, she could take comfort by the end of the year from a long and favourable review in the *Quarterly*. Even her own opinion of the volume increased as its reception continued favourable, for on 22 June she writes: "really I do think of that Volume (& I never thought so of Julian, or of any thing else of mine) that there are parts of it, which are good, & if known would prosper" (R).

Furthermore her intentions in publishing the book were adequately realized. As early as September 1824, George Whittaker had asked her for a second series of *Our Village* sketches,<sup>3</sup> though this was not to appear until 1826. But by the end of 1825 Miss Mitford was assured of regular employment as a prose writer. On 15 December she tells Talfourd that she has been solicited for articles by the various annual publications,<sup>4</sup> and that she has sent them off. And on 21 December she writes:

<sup>1</sup> *Our Village* was reviewed in the *Examiner* on 23 May 1824 (p. 332). The reviewer was apparently not Talfourd, for in a letter of 22 June, in the John Rylands Library, Miss Mitford writes, "Who could write that kind notice in the *Examiner*? It seemed an unusual thing—and you know any thing kinder than ordinary is laid at your door of course".

<sup>2</sup> See the *Somerset House Gazette*, and *Literary Museum*: or, *Weekly Miscellany of Fine Arts, Antiquities, and Literary Chat*, ii (22 May 1824), 104-5.

<sup>3</sup> She mentions this in a letter of 23-26 September, in the Harvard University Library.

<sup>4</sup> The letter is in the Harvard University Library.

“Mr. Thelwall is setting up a new periodical<sup>1</sup> in opposition to Mr. Baylis<sup>2</sup> & has sent me an offer of 10 guineas a sheet—I have sent articles to both” (R). Her work had happily prospered and she could now keep house on *both* sides of the street.

<sup>1</sup> John Thelwall (1764-1834), reformer and lecturer on elecution. The first issue of his new magazine, the *Panoramic Miscellany*, came out on 31 January 1826.

<sup>2</sup> Of Cox and Baylis, the printers of the *Monthly Magazine ; or, British Register of Literature, Sciences, and the Belles-Lettres*, New Series (London, 1826-39).



## THE IMMEDIATE SOURCES OF THE EXCHEQUER DOMESDAY

By R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

NO one who collates even a substantial portion of the Exchequer Domesday for the south-western counties with the Exeter Domesday would ever doubt that the former was derived either from the latter, or from something closely resembling it. But this view has not been universally held. Round, I think with good cause, avoided the problem altogether.<sup>1</sup> Eyton thought that the Exchequer clerks never saw the Exeter text.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Salzmänn has also claimed that "a careful examination of the two Domesdays shows no trace . . . of influence of the Exeter Book upon the scribe who drew up the Exchequer abstract . . . and proves them to be independent compilations".<sup>3</sup> Reichel maintained that the Exeter and Exchequer Domesdays were entirely independent compilations, but that "parts of the Exeter Book were taken from the Exchequer Book".<sup>4</sup>

Neither of the last two commentators made any attempt to combat the impressive and detailed evidence in favour of the Exchequer Domesday having been constructed from something very like the Exeter Domesday, produced by Baring, and accepted by Whale.<sup>5</sup> The views of Baring have been endorsed, and additional evidence in support of them cited, in recent articles by Professor Galbraith and Mr. Sawyer.<sup>6</sup> To repeat or summarize Baring's arguments is totally unnecessary; they include the

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Round, *Feudal England*, p. 146, n. 265.

<sup>2</sup> R. W. Eyton, *Domesday Studies: Somerset*, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *V.C.H. : Cornwall*, Part 8, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *V.C.H. : Devonshire*, pp. 377-9.

<sup>5</sup> F. H. Baring, "The Exeter Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii, 309; T.W. Whale, "Analysis of the Devonshire Domesday", *Trans. Dev. Assn.*, vol. xxviii; 'History of the Exon Domesday' (ibid. xxxvii, 266); "Principles of the Somerset Domesday", *Proc. Bath Nat. Hist. and Ant. Field Club*, x. 13.

<sup>6</sup> V. H. Galbraith, "The Making of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii. 161; P. H. Sawyer, "The 'Original Returns' and 'Domesday Book'", ibid. lxx. 178.

failure of the Exchequer clerks to supply information absent from the Exeter Domesday, their exact reproduction of significant phrases and words (e.g. *iiii virgates* instead of the more usual one hide), the order of entries in both texts, the unnecessary repetition of duplicated material, and the copying of obvious errors. It is difficult to find an Exchequer entry which gives the smallest suggestion of having been derived from a source which was not ultimately the Exeter text, and in his article Baring provided cogent explanations of the few divergencies which are not obvious errors mentioned by earlier commentators. A scrupulous collation of the two versions continually suggests that the Exchequer clerks had nothing to aid them in their task of compressing, contracting, and rearranging Inquest material except a source of information which was either the surviving Exeter Domesday or a close approximation thereto. For they failed altogether to supplement the deficiencies of the Exeter Domesday, and they never give the smallest suggestion that they had at their disposal any other product of the Domesday Inquest.

But there are indeed a few entries, the Exchequer version of which contains information which is not recorded in the surviving Exeter text. The inference must be either that the Exchequer clerks had at their disposal documents supplementary to the Exeter Domesday (which on the evidence given by Baring seems improbable), or that they were using a copy of the Exeter Domesday which on occasion included improvements on the text we possess, but which also may not have contained certain late additions to the surviving Exeter version.

As early as 1884 the Palaeographical Society suggested that a copy must have been made of the Exeter Domesday. The note to its reproductions of portions thereof points out that occasional phrases are in a handwriting totally unlike anything else found therein, and that since they include *usque hoc scripsit R.*, *hoc scripsit Ricardus*, "it is evident that they cannot refer to the compilation of the present MS., but are probably the memoranda of persons engaged on a fair copy."<sup>1</sup> The fairly frequent appearance of the words *consummatum est* might also indicate the stage a

<sup>1</sup> 2nd ser., vol. ii, part i, II, plates 70, 71. The above phrases are on fols. 414, 316.

copying of the original had reached, rather than that of the checking of the text which, on the evidence of the corrections, interlineations, *marginalia*, postscripts, and underscoring of obvious errors, clearly took place.<sup>1</sup> *Consummatum est* is usually in rough capitals at the foot of a page, and does not look to me as if it was inscribed by any of the clerks who wrote the text of the Exeter Domesday.

Thirty years after Baring's article appeared, Professor Galbraith advanced the hypothesis that what we inconveniently style "Little Domesday", the record of Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, might be a revised copy of a document parallel to the Exeter Domesday, an improved transcript made in the provinces and sent to Winchester, which, for some reason, was never converted into an Exchequer Domesday for these counties.<sup>2</sup> Why the work of rearrangement and contraction was never done we can only guess; perhaps before it had begun King William I was dead, and the inspiration of the Inquest and its products had lapsed.<sup>3</sup>

Only the account of twelve Dorset fiefs survives in the *Liber Exoniensis*. But within the appropriate Exchequer folios are two pieces of information which are not given in the Exeter Domesday. Long Bredy is said to have land for nine teams; the Exeter text does not say how many teams can plough this land.<sup>4</sup> But this in no way proves that the manuscript used by the Exchequer clerk

<sup>1</sup> These words appear on fols. 209b (209 is blank), and 490 (which ends the Devonshire material); and at the end of Somerset fiefs on fols. 155, 370b (370 blank), 387b (386b-7 blank), 449b, 451b (451 blank), 474b (474 blank), 476b, and 494b, which completes the Exeter Domesday proper. All, except 155, are the final folios of booklets. In the margin of 316 is the word *probatio*.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 165. See p. 64 below.

<sup>3</sup> Additional suggestions of this are possibly afforded by the fact that the Exchequer version is obviously incomplete—the Dorset record ends in the middle of an entry—and that while it contains numerous marginal memoranda made with a view to the blanks being filled in, practically none of these was. The theory that, when the Winchester authorities saw what a bulky volume these counties made, they ordered the compression of the remainder in the form of the Exchequer text, is surely untenable.

<sup>4</sup> *Langebride* (78ai), *Langebridia* (37b). References to the text of the Exchequer Domesday are distinguished from those to the Exeter or to "Little" Domesday, where the distinction is not obvious, by the inclusion of i or 2 to indicate the column in which they appear.



contained this statement. On numerous occasions it seems as if the Exchequer clerks were of the opinion that there should be a team for each ploughland (and by implication, therefore, a ploughland for each team). Over and over again they write *terra est i caruca, et ibi est*. Not infrequently they record that there is land for so many teams, but that there are in fact more teams than ploughlands.<sup>1</sup> They may, indeed, noticing that there were nine teams at Long Bredy, and though their source, as fol. 37b does not, perhaps did not give the number of ploughlands, have argued that there should so be nine ploughlands, and wrote down that there were this number there rather than note marginally that this piece of information must be sought out.<sup>2</sup>

But the second case they could not have deduced. At Spettisbury pasture is twice mentioned, and the second instance of it is said to be *in alio loco*. The Exchequer version says also that this is *super aquam*—a statement unrecorded in the Exeter Domesday.<sup>3</sup>

The Cornish Domesdays provide rather more examples of discrepancies between the two texts. The Exchequer version records a team not mentioned in the Exeter text, and the phrase *ibi est i car.* is hardly likely to have been inserted in error, for seven ploughlands are mentioned.<sup>4</sup> It also (on the second occasion as an interlineation) tells us, which the Exeter text does not, that two manors never gelded.<sup>5</sup> Twice the Exchequer version has *silva minuta* where the Exeter Domesday has *nemus*; the latter's term for coppice or underwood is *nemusculus*.<sup>6</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Terra est dimid car. In dominio tamen est i car.* (Colforde, 93b2); *Terra est dim. car. Hanc habet ibi i villanus* (Strengestone, 97a2).

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the best example of marginal *memoranda* is that against *Tingdene* (220ai), where there is in the margin, in red (suggesting it is late work), *rq. hid. num.*, and between the xx and the vii is a gap, suggesting that the vii was added later. Incidentally, the figure could have been obtained by adding up the details given later in the entry. At *Otritone* (104a2), *r car.* is written in the margin against what must have been a blank for the teams or ploughlands. See also 247ai.

<sup>3</sup> *Spehtesberie* (82ai), *Spehtesberia* (47b).

<sup>4</sup> *Lannachebran* (121a2, 205b).

<sup>5</sup> *Heglosenuder* (121ai), *Hecglosenuda* (203); *Langoroch* (121a2), *Langorrocc* (206).

<sup>6</sup> *Torleberg* (124ai), *Tirlebera* (233b); *Forchetestane* (125a2), *Forchetestana* (334b). Exchequer and Exeter place-name forms often differ widely—see P. H. Sawyer, "The Place-Names of the Domesday Manuscripts", *BULLETIN OF THE*

unlikely that this is due to miscopying by the Exchequer clerk ; it seems far more probable that the " Exeter " text at his disposal had been corrected.

The Exeter version says that *Polhal* was held T.R.E. by " Win ", which in the Exchequer text becomes *Vluuin*.<sup>1</sup> We have three explanations from which to choose : either " Win " was correct, and the Exchequer clerk, unfamiliar with the name but used to that of " Ulwin ", made an unnecessary correction of it, or he knew " Win " must be wrong, and changed it, or the original of the manuscript he was using had been altered.<sup>2</sup> *Wulfwine*, as a name, is of frequent occurrence. Exchequer clerks occasionally made unfortunate improvements ; e.g. one turned *Incrintona*, which is the modern Ilkerton, into *in Crintone*, postulating a holding " in " the non-existent Crinton.<sup>3</sup> The " Juhell " of the cross-heading on 334b is " Judhel de Totenais " in that of 125a2, but the Exchequer clerk may have been familiar with the influential Breton's style and title. But either he knew that the " Bluhid Brito " who was holding *Treuithel* of Robert of Mortain was the " Blohin " who in the Exchequer Domesday holds this manor, and four other manors in both Exeter (where he is usually " Blohin ") and Exchequer Domesdays, and with whose holdings he brigades that of " Bluhid Brito ", or there was an intermediate text from which he derived the information.<sup>4</sup>

The Exchequer Domesday for Somerset, in its account of Taunton, says *de moneta l solidis*. No mint is mentioned within the long passage about borough and manor in the Exeter version, and the probability is that the clerk found the information in a corrected copy he was using, and not in some extraneous source.<sup>5</sup> In the account of the sub-tenancy at Crewkerne, the Exchequer

JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, vol. 38, no. 2—but it has been considered unnecessary here always to give both forms. No adequate suggestion has yet been made as to how the Exchequer conversion of name-forms was effected.

<sup>1</sup> 124b2, 261b.

<sup>2</sup> " Win " (Wine ?) does not appear as a proper name elsewhere in Domesday Book, except on fols. 231b, 123a2 (*Clunewic*), though a name such as Winegodus does (*Bodeslega*, 164).

<sup>3</sup> 402, 110bi. The *Clinton* of the *Inq. Com. Cant.* (97b) is *Ichelintone* in Domesday Book (198ai) ; this is the modern Ickleton.

<sup>4</sup> 125ai ; 258b, 263.

<sup>5</sup> 87bi, 173b-5b.

text includes a *servus* who is not recorded in the Exeter version.<sup>1</sup> The value of one of the Chinnock manors is given in the Exeter text as £12 for both relevant dates ; the Exchequer clerk gives this sum for the value in 1086, but a hundred shillings for the earlier value (*Cinioc* ; 274, 92bi.)

A further suggestion that the Exeter Domesday was copied is possibly contained in the Woodspring entry. This states that 4 hides 3 virgates are in demesne, but does not mention any demesne teams. The Exchequer clerk wrote *in dominio*, but then left a blank. Was the information missing in his copy of the Exeter Domesday, or, since he rarely records the hidage of the demesne, did he hope elsewhere to discover the number of demesne teams ?<sup>2</sup>

In the Exeter Domesday, Pitney is described in the penultimate entry under *Terra Regis*, followed by a separate entry for an anonymous *i mansio*. The Exchequer clerk combined these into a single entry for Pitney. Whether he was altogether wrong to do so, or whether his source or some auxiliary document told him that the second manor was also called Pitney (it is quite possible that it *was* a Pitney manor), we cannot tell.<sup>3</sup> The Exeter text does not say that the four demesne teams at Shapwick were " elsewhere " (*alibi*), though it does make it clear that the twelve teams of the *villani* were on the *terra ad xx carrucas* which had never gelded. All the Exeter text says of the second of Roger of Courseulles's sub-tenancies in the manor of Doultling is *inde tenet* ; both versions agree that the first was at Charlton, but the Exchequer clerk either knew or deduced that the pair were *in Cerletone et alibi*, which the surviving Exeter text would not have told him.<sup>4</sup>

About a number of words and phrases which appear in the Exchequer text but are not to be found in the Exeter Domesday there may well remain an element of doubt. They might, but with no great justification, be considered to be evidence of the availability to the Exchequer clerks of a source of information which was not the Exeter Domesday or a copy thereof, but with greater reason to be derived from improvements in this copy, or

<sup>1</sup> *Cruche*, 91a2, 197.

<sup>3</sup> 116, 116b ; 87a2.

<sup>2</sup> *Worspringa* ; 369b, 96b2.

<sup>4</sup> 90ai, 161b ; 90bi, 167b.



appearing as a result of conversion, by copyist or Exchequer clerk, of an implication into a different mode of expression. For example, it is said of Frome that Rainbald *ibi est presbyter*, a phrase which does not appear in the Exeter text, though he is mentioned as holding the church of St. John's, Frome, both before and after the Conquest. Two tenants are said to hold two manors added to the manor of Taunton, *per concessione regis W.*, which again is not in the Exeter Domesday, and nor is the statement that they hold them from the Bishop of Winchester.<sup>1</sup> Again, four manors which had been Glastonbury Abbey thegnland and which the Bishop of Coutances now holds are said to be worth *c solidos et amplius*. In the Exeter Domesday these are also separately described in four distinct entries, and the total values amount to £11 10s. 0d. ; of the pair whose values are given in the entry corresponding to the above, the value is given as 90s.<sup>2</sup>

Obviously it is impossible to determine, when Exeter and Exchequer versions differ, whether the Exchequer clerk was at fault, or the copy he was using had been altered, purposely or accidentally, when the surviving Exeter text was copied. On the whole the character and volume of the differences suggest that most cases of discrepancy are due to mistakes by an Exchequer clerk, and, unless the guilt is that of the copyists of the Exeter Domesday, the Exchequer writers certainly show a large number of omissions.<sup>3</sup> As regards changes, Alnod becomes Alwold, and Alward, Alwald, for example.<sup>4</sup> The Exchequer writer styles Glastonbury, *villa*—a term not applied to it by the Exeter clerk, but this may have been no more than the employment of a commonplace term. The Devonshire sheriff is simply Baldwin on fol. 315, *Balduinus de Execestre* on 93ai, but presumably an Exchequer clerk would be familiar with this description of him.

<sup>1</sup> 86bi, 90b ; 87bi, 175.

<sup>2</sup> 91ai, 172. There is discrepancy in the accounts in the Glastonbury and Coutances fiefs ; e.g. Stratton is said to be worth 40s. on 172b, £4 on 146, but Hescumbe 50s. on both 172b and 136b.

<sup>3</sup> In the Exchequer Domesday for Somerset there are over 120 statistical differences with the Exeter text, and almost one hundred cases of omission of material which it was no part of the set plan should be ignored. A complete list is to be given in vol. v. of the *Domesday Geography of England* (C.U.P.)

<sup>4</sup> *Litelitone* ; 89ai, 149 ; *Sewelle* ; 92ai, 268.

Instances of divergencies between the two versions drawn from the concluding folios of an Exchequer text need to be considered with reserve, for it is plain that the clerk or clerks became less scrupulous and detailed towards the end of the account of a shire. Thus, when we find three teams recorded for the three ploughlands of *Newetone* in the Exchequer text, but no demesne team and only two tenants' teams in the Exeter record, it may be unsafe to presume that a demesne team appeared in a corrected Exeter copy.<sup>1</sup> The Exchequer clerk may have decided that there must have been one demesne team, to make three for the three teamlands. The change from Goric to Godric could well be intelligent deduction, not a correction in the copy.<sup>2</sup>

To the manor of Wellington had been added a hide which, according to the Exchequer text, had been held *pro manerio*. The Exeter Domesday merely says that it had been held *pariter*. Now collation of the very large number of entries appropriate, including those of *Terrae Occupatae*, strongly suggests that to an Inquest clerk *pro manerio*, *pariter*, and *libere* were virtually interchangeable terms.<sup>3</sup> The Exchequer clerks, "revelling in synonym and paraphrase", may merely, on many occasions where their text and that of the Exeter version diverge, have changed the vocabulary while preserving the implication—and it may be that they felt free to add an occasional phrase, such as has been indicated above, provided the sense and meaning were not impaired. It is extremely obvious that the inclusion of such terms, and varying phrases regarding a man's freedom or reverse to "go with his land to what lordship he would" were derived from an aspect of the Inquest which was of major importance in the execution of its intentions.

The Devonshire texts are perhaps less revealing. But the case of the figures for Sidbury is a puzzling one. The Exchequer text gives it 5 hides, not 3 as in the Exeter version, 30 ploughlands

<sup>1</sup> 98b2, 478. There is a parallel case at *Midelstone* on 98b2, 479.

<sup>2</sup> *Tatewiche*; 99a2, 465.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Belluton; 87a2 *pro uno manerio*, 114, *libere*: or Staunton in Minehead (95b2, 359b), or Tickenham (96bi, 438b). But, especially where the Exeter text says that two estates are now held as one manor (e.g. Badgworth, 95ai, 351, or Horsington, 96b2, 356), the Exchequer clerk could deduce that they had been held *pro ii maneriis*.

against 20, 25 tenants' teams against 18. The figure 18 is written over an erasure. Frequently though the Exchequer clerks made mistakes in their statistics, we can hardly visualize three of this character in a single entry. *T.R.E.* there had been two holdings, and it may be that the Exeter text gives us the figures for one of them only. Since the figures for classes of population and appurtenances are identical, whence did the Exchequer clerk derive his information?—from a corrected copy or from extraneous material? <sup>1</sup>

Another puzzle is that of a Buckland entry. The Exeter Domesday mentions that a slave dwells (*manet*) on the ferling which is not in demesne, but the Exchequer clerk records a second slave and also a villein. This certainly suggests either adequate editing of a copy of the Exchequer Domesday or independent material.<sup>2</sup>

But most of the relevant material of the Devonshire Domesday leaves us in doubt whether the Exchequer clerks derived certain material from additions to a copy of the Exeter text, or included words and phrases which, though not before them, they felt should be supplied. Colaton Raleigh in the Exeter version is said to have *xl agros et xvi agros prati*. The Exchequer clerk did not combine these as 56 acres of meadow; perhaps, noticing that pasture was separately recorded, he guessed and wrote down that the 40 acres were woodland, which normally precedes meadow and pasture in the Exeter version.<sup>3</sup> That the "two acres" at South Brent are of woodland is not said on fol. 183b; perhaps the clerk writing 104ai deduced that since meadow and pasture were separately mentioned, they must be woodland. There are three other cases where the Exchequer clerk mentions that some quantity was of woodland or meadow or pasture when the Exeter text does not, but in each this is implied by the details of the Exeter Domesday. An acre of wood at *Holebema* in the Exeter version becomes one of meadow in the Exchequer text; no pasture is recorded in either, and probably, as the Exeter version had already mentioned ten acres of wood, the Exchequer clerk assumed it must have meant pasture.<sup>4</sup> Twice the Exchequer

<sup>1</sup> 118b, 102ai.

<sup>3</sup> 96b, 101ai.

<sup>2</sup> 129b, 102b2.

<sup>4</sup> 471, 117a2.

clerk adds "acres" though these are not mentioned in the Exeter Domesday. But as the quantities are 20 and 40, they would hardly be furlongs or leagues.<sup>1</sup>

The Exeter Domesday does not record any ploughlands for Warcombe. The Exchequer clerk wrote *terra est ii car.*, but since there was a demesne team and a tenants' team, he may have argued that two teams necessitated two ploughlands.<sup>2</sup>

There are several further cases where the Exchequer clerk records teams which do not appear in the Exeter Domesday. At Romansleigh the former notes five tenants' teams, but in the Exeter version Nigel's land has three only, and none is attributed to Robert's share of the manor; a demesne team at Upexe is not to be found in the Exeter text.<sup>3</sup> In the first entry for *Bihede*, the Exchequer text says that there is land for one team, and that this (*hanc*) four bordars have. It might be thought to imply the presence of a team, which the Exeter version does not mention, but it may well be read to mean that the bordars have the ploughland.<sup>4</sup> At Poughill, where there are two ploughlands, the Exeter Domesday simply says, *in eam sunt carr(ucae)*. The Exchequer clerk says "there is land for two teams, which are there", but here, too, seeing that there *were* teams noted, he may have worked on the principle that every teamland should normally have its team.<sup>5</sup>

It looks as if the Exchequer clerks may from their own knowledge have added style and title. As in Cornwall, Juhell becomes Judhel of Totnes.<sup>6</sup> Ansger is not "of Montaignu" in the Exeter version, but the Exchequer scribe (113ai) could have derived the title from the foot of fol. 456, where some of the *franci milites* are listed, if this list was in the copy (it is not printed in the Record Commission text).

<sup>1</sup> *Chentesberia*, 299b, 107ai; *Willedenna*, 377, 116bi.

<sup>2</sup> 129, 102b2.

<sup>3</sup> *Liege*; 103b2, 179b; *Vlpeesse*, 103ai, 132. There is a similar case at *Morceth*, 103ai, 132b.

<sup>4</sup> 112a2, 395.

<sup>5</sup> 414b, 115a2. Frequently, when the number of teamlands and teams do not coincide, the Exchequer says that there is land for so many teams but that, however (*tamen*), there is a different number of teams there.

<sup>6</sup> 316, 108bi.



Twice the Exchequer text says that an estate 'gelded' for so many hides and virgates when the Exeter version does not.<sup>1</sup> But we cannot say that the expression must have been in the copy; the Exchequer clerk may have included it because it was the customary phrase. He states that *Duueltona*, added to Brictric's land, was done so *injuste*: the term is not in the Exeter version, though commonly it is in similar entries; it may even in some way equate with the Exeter statement that a man could "go with his land to what lord he would".<sup>2</sup>

In the marginal entry about the customary rights of the manor of Ermington, the Exeter text mentions separately the two manors each known as *Dunitona*. It gives no suggestion of the Exchequer's *altera Dunitona*, but a clerk might easily have evolved the distinction for himself.<sup>3</sup> Again, the Exeter scribe did not set down that King Edward had held Barnstaple and Lydford *in dominio*. But the Exchequer clerk was transcribing the matter under the heading *Dominicatus Regis*, and may thence have derived the phrase.<sup>4</sup>

We find instances of tenurial status in the Devonshire record similar to those of Somerset. The *libere* of the Exeter version is on various occasions *pariter*, *pariter et potuit ire ad quemlibet dominium*, *et potuit ire cum sua terra ad quemlibet dominium*.<sup>5</sup> *Libere* is in at least one instance in the Exchequer but not in the Exeter text (but in the first the tenant could "go where he would", in the latter "separate" from the owner of the manor); the "land of three thegns" in the Exeter version is held "for three manors" in the Exchequer.<sup>6</sup>

Much of the above is derivable from the Record Commissioners' editions of Domesday Book, or from the translations and footnotes in the Victoria County Histories (though a warning must be given that each contains numerous errors and omissions).

<sup>1</sup> *Holcoma*, 336b, 114ai; 408, 115bi. The entries refer to two widely separated places.

<sup>2</sup> 116a2, 462. See also p. 54 above. Not all these, of course, would be *injuste*.

<sup>3</sup> 85b, 100b2.

<sup>4</sup> 87b, 100a2.

<sup>5</sup> 96, 100b2 (*Wirige*); 86, 100bi (*Ferlie*); 98, 101b2 (*Nimetone*); 125, 102bi (*Colrige*), and many other cases.

<sup>6</sup> *Iwis*, 116bi, 376b; *Tavi*, 318, 108b2.

But only the surviving manuscripts can demonstrate a further curiosity. In several instances in which Exeter and Exchequer texts disagree, the latter gives a figure which is that of the Exeter version *before* this was finally corrected. For example, the number of ploughlands at Modbury (217b, 104b2) is in the Exchequer version given as twenty-three. This, it seems, was what was originally recorded in the Exeter version, but in contrast to the brownish ink of xxiii, a black i has been added between xx and iii. The value of Beer is *iii librae* in Exchequer (104ai), but in Exeter (184) an obviously postscriptal fourth i appears. The Exchequer's value for Great Torrington (116bi) is £20, Exeter's £15; and the £15 has been written over an erasure (376b). Similar instances are by no means confined to the ploughlands and values: they occur, for example, in connection with the number of furlongs or acres of coppice (Down St. Mary, 182, 103b2; Ide, 117b, 101a2). The Exeter manuscript suggests that despite the numerous obvious errors and inaccuracies which went unnoticed, it was on the whole very carefully checked and amended, and it is quite conceivable that supplementary alterations should be made in it. The fact that some of these did not find their way into the Exchequer Domesday rather suggests, first, that they were made after a copy was constructed for use at Winchester; secondly, that this copy was perhaps made as soon as the entries for a fief, so far as the individual Hundred or group of Hundreds was concerned, were thought to be complete.<sup>1</sup>

That the surviving Exeter Domesday was sent to Winchester for transformation into the Exchequer Domesday is, on the face of it, improbable. It bears few signs of hard usage, and it is most unlikely that, once at Winchester, it would be returned to Exeter, the provincial capital. But it is altogether likely that the province would have such great need of its own digest of the results of the Inquest that what was despatched to Winchester was a transcript of it. Moreover the "original returns" would be impossibly

<sup>1</sup> See also p. 70, n. 2. For the "group of Hundreds basis" for the construction of the Exeter version—a regular territorial basis and sequence are most marked—see R. Welldon Finn, "The Making of the Devonshire Domesdays", *Trans. Dev. Assn.* vol. 89 (March, 1958). The whole question of the construction of the Exeter Domesday is one which I hope before long to discuss.

bulky for Exchequer use. The text shows that the Inquest left many doubtful points undetermined and many problems unsolved, and it seems likely that there were anticipated further official visits to enquire into the illegalities of occupation and inheritance which, e.g. at Ely and Canterbury, had needed investigation by royal legates. The availability locally of a copy of the statements made to the *legati regis* would be essential. A copy made and sent to Winchester may or may not have included sections of the *Liber Exoniensis* such as the Summaries or *Terrae Occupatae*, since the Exchequer clerks included neither in their condensation. Perhaps such material was included with a transcript for some provinces, for a Summary was inscribed, though no doubt in error, in the Yorkshire Domesday.<sup>1</sup> The *invasiones* were recorded in what seems to be a copy of the eastern counties' material; the *clamores* are reproduced in the Exchequer text for certain midland and northern shires. It is possible that *Terrae Occupatae* was constructed with a view to the availability of a brief record of outstanding Inquest difficulties if the Exeter Domesday was not to be copied, but forwarded to Winchester.

To whom, it may be asked, was the work of copying the Exeter Domesday entrusted, and what form did the copy take? To these questions we probably shall never know the answers, but we may be able to estimate the probabilities. The existence of two passages within the surviving Exeter Domesday, written in the script of Exchequer clerks, and making use of the formulae, vocabulary, and order of material of the Exchequer Domesday, may suggest that these owe their origin to Winchester writers sent to advise on the compilation of the Exeter Domesday and perhaps to copy it for transformation into Exchequer form.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, there is no *proof* whatever that the Exchequer text was not produced in the provinces, county by county.<sup>3</sup> But serious difficulties militate against the adoption of such a theory. We

<sup>1</sup> 381a2. On fol. 138 is a largely illegible erasure which suggests to me that a Summary of the lands of the Bishop of Coutances was begun in the body of the Exeter text, just as a Glastonbury Summary was added to fol. 173.

<sup>2</sup> These passages are discussed and reproduced in R. Welldon Finn, "The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvi. 561.

<sup>3</sup> But if it was, why was no Exchequer Domesday for the eastern counties, inscribed county by county, drawn up?

are told that the "writings" were brought to King William, and it is far more likely that these were transcripts, province by province, of Exeter and "Little" Domesday type, of the initial rearrangement of Inquest material, than that they were the existing Exchequer quires and leaves.<sup>1</sup> Apparently the only place they could have been brought to him, if delivery to a single place is implied, is either Winchester, where he spent the Easter of 1086, or Salisbury on the occasion of his Lammas visit in the same year.<sup>2</sup> The oath taken at Salisbury, when "all the people occupying land who were of any account over all England, whosoever vassals they might be, . . . all submitted to him and became his vassals and swore allegiance to him that they would be loyal to him against all other men", might have a significance additional to the report of the chronicler: it may be that on that occasion the tenants-in-chief formally accepted the truth and justice of what had been inscribed in these "writings". Secondly, if the Exchequer text had been produced in the provinces, we should expect it to contain fewer *lacunae* and errors than it does, for presumably the "original returns" would still be available for consultation, in the shire towns or the provincial capitals, and we might expect the Exeter Domesday to have been further corrected and supplemented if that had been the method of procedure. The existence of the Summaries, of the geld accounts, and of *Terrae Occupatae* within the *Liber Exoniensis*, and their omission from the Exchequer text, suggest that it was intended to conduct enquiries into the disclosures of the Inquest locally and not centrally, as would certainly be the logical procedure.

We cannot, of course, be sure what form a copy of the Exeter Domesday may have taken, but the probability is that in arrangement, composition, and content it differed very little from the surviving text. It does not seem very likely, even though Exchequer clerks made entries in the Exeter Domesday, that they constructed or superintended a transcript which condensed, omitted, and combined information as was done for the making of

<sup>1</sup> Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *sub anno* 1086.

<sup>2</sup> As Winchester was the home of the Treasury, it seems unlikely that the "writings" were brought to Westminster, where he was at Whitsuntide.



the Exchequer text. Had they done so, there would probably be fewer errors, omissions, and marginal and postscriptal matter than there is in the Exchequer production. Certain inclusions therein, most uncharacteristic of the Exchequer version, but identical with what we find in the Exeter Domesday, suggest most strongly that they automatically and unthinkingly copied by accident phrases which are commonplaces in "Exeter" work. The Exeter clerks, when indicating the time for which the former value of a manor is given, usually say *quando recepit*. This the Exchequer scribes usually convert into a simple *valebat* or *valuit* or *olim*, but there are a number of instances of *quando recepit* in the Exchequer text, suggesting that often enough they copied literally the phrase before them.<sup>1</sup> Practically every Exeter entry opens by saying that someone holds one manor 'which is called Y'. The Exchequer clerks normally open 'someone holds Y', but on not a few occasions the Exeter formula *quod vocatur* appears.<sup>2</sup> The Exchequer clerks usually contract their *manerium* to  $\overline{M}$ , but here and there the Exeter's equivalent *mansio* appears, as though the writer forgot to make the customary change.<sup>3</sup> Frequently, too, the Exchequer text lists the classes of population in their Exeter order, which is that of social or economic importance—*villani*, *bordarii*, *servi*—instead of bringing the *servi* to the beginning and associating them with the demesne land and teams as they usually do.<sup>4</sup>

The formulae and vocabulary of the Exeter Domesday, and of "Little Domesday", are frequently so unlike those of the Exchequer Domesday that occasional appearances of the former in the latter, in shires for which we have no earlier text, suggest that here too the clerks making an Exchequer Domesday worked from provincial transcripts. We find, for example, the Exeter formula *ea die qua rex E. fuit vivus et mortuus* in Surrey, and here and in Hampshire and in Worcestershire *quod vocatur* before a

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g. 96bi-97ai.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *Ragiol* (90b2), *Dinnitone* (91bi), *Tavetone* (106bi), *Laierta* (107ai), *Sanctus Germanus* (120bi), *Gargalle* (122ai).

<sup>3</sup> E.g. *Chivele* (69b2). The Exchequer *manerium* is occasionally found in the Exeter Domesday, e.g. on 53 and 179.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Tarente* (83b2), *Aissecote* (90a2), *Iohannestou* (112bi).

place-name.<sup>1</sup> These and other "provincial phrases" are indeed widely dispersed through the Exchequer Domesday, and none is confined to a single region.<sup>2</sup> The mention of four *afri* at *Clive* might be because here the Exchequer clerk forgot to omit the livestock recorded in the provincial draft.<sup>3</sup>

A suggestion not only of the construction of the Exchequer Domesday from documents of Exeter Domesday type, grouped by "provinces", but also of these being the only material available to the clerks, is to be found in the fact that certain entries are in the Exchequer Domesday in altogether the wrong county and folios. *Gessic* certainly, and a holding in *Gelingeham* most probably, which appear in the Wiltshire Domesday, should have been placed in that for Dorset.<sup>4</sup> The former is one of the Gussages near Wimborne St. Giles, and seems to be indicated by the geld account for Badbury Hundred, which says that Earl Aubrey had held  $8\frac{3}{4}$  hides *de terra Geldanti*.<sup>5</sup> He has no mention in the Dorset Domesday, and the Gussage entry is the last in the section devoted to the lands he had held in Wiltshire before he resigned his northern earldom and his lands passed *in manu regis*. What had probably happened is this; the Exeter clerk must have forgotten to insert before *Gessic* a cross-head of the type *Terra quae fuit Alberici comitis* (which appears before his Wiltshire lands) in *Dorseta*, or else the Exchequer clerk failed to notice its existence. If it was of the character of that distinguishing the Somerset from the Devonshire lands of Glastonbury Abbey, he may well have missed it, for the account of her Somerset estates begins on the same line as that which concludes the record of her solitary Devonshire manor, and at the end of this line, out in the margin in two lines, are merely the words *In Sumerseta*.<sup>6</sup> It is impossible to guess how the Gillingham error may have occurred,

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Cuntune* (48b2), *Sudwerche* (32ai), *Witcerce* (41ai), *Oswaldeslau Hundred* (172bi). *Tempore regis Eduardi*, the Exchequer formula, appears quite often in the Exeter text, but infrequently compared with its characteristic phrase.

<sup>2</sup> They are to be found, e.g. at *Comenore* (58bi), *Stibenhede* (127a2), *Grimanleh* (173b2), *Meratun* (183bi).

<sup>3</sup> 165ai.

<sup>4</sup> 69ai, 73bi.

<sup>5</sup> 18b. See *VCH: Wilts*, ii. 135, 175, 217.

<sup>6</sup> Fol. 161. There are other cross-heads which could easily have been missed; e.g. that for William of Falaise's Somerset lands (369), which runs on to the text of the preceding fief.

but that the holding should have been entered under Dorset is suggested by the fact that the geld account for the Dorset Hundred of Gillingham says that "Fulcredus" has  $2\frac{1}{2}$  virgates in demesne, which seems to imply the three virgates of the *in Gelingeham* entry. No other mention of this man in the Dorset geld accounts can be implied.

Absence of the essential headings which alone could guide the Exchequer clerk with only material of an "Exeter Domesday" type at his disposal is the most probable explanation of the fact that the Northamptonshire Domesday contains so many entries which belong to other shires. It includes the Oxfordshire estates of the Bishop of Coutances.<sup>1</sup> Both the manors of St. Remy at Rheims which appear in it are and were in Staffordshire and have against them the name of a Staffordshire Hundred.<sup>2</sup> In addition, a Warwickshire manor belonging to Thorney Abbey (222bi), two manors of the Count of Mellend and one of Gilbert de Gand, four in Oxfordshire belonging to Hugh de Grentmaisnil and one which is William Peverel's, two of William FitzAnsculf's, one of which is in Staffordshire and the other in Warwickshire, are all within the Northamptonshire section.<sup>3</sup> These errors do not suggest an intensely careful or systematic checking of the Exchequer Domesday, and in every case these come at the end of the relevant fief, as if a landholder's manors in several adjacent shires, which we may think were within the same Inquest group of shires, were, as they are in the Exeter Domesday, inscribed on the same sheet and in the same booklet. The presumption must be that the cross-heading indicating the shire in which the holdings were was omitted or went unnoticed. There seems to be some additional suggestion that the document which the Exchequer clerks were using to make the account of Warwickshire did not clearly, or perhaps at all (except by means of the ascription of manors to Hundreds), indicate the county in which each of the Bishop of Coutances's lands lay, for the aspect

<sup>1</sup> From *Finemere* onwards, 221ai.

<sup>2</sup> 222b2; the account of this fief looks as if it might be a late entry.

<sup>3</sup> These manors of the Count of Mellend are postscriptal, written right across 224a. This further suggests that the structure of their source was not clear to the Exchequer clerk. The other references are 227bi, 224b, 226a2 (*bis*).

of 238b suggests that the account of his Warwickshire fief was squeezed in after the preceding and succeeding accounts had been inscribed.

Assuming that Professor Galbraith is right in suggesting that "Little Domesday" is a fair copy of a document of Exeter Domesday type, sent to Winchester for the making of an Exchequer version thereof,<sup>1</sup> its text ought to suggest that its source was a document strongly resembling the Exeter Domesday in form, for it is reasonable to assume that each provincial body of clerks worked to a more or less uniform plan. A fair copy it most certainly is, for the interlineations, *marginalia*, and postscripts are remarkably few. There are only forty-two interlineations in the 107 double-sided folios of the Essex Domesday, which is by far the most heavily corrected of the three counties concerned, and very few of these consist of more than a few words or a figure omitted in the copying. Since the postscripts consist chiefly of odd words omitted originally, or deal with illegal acquisitions, changes in manorial structure, and property in the borough of Colchester, it is probable that in the original most of these were late interpolations occupying similar positions, and copied literally or with the advisability of incorporating them in the text overlooked.<sup>2</sup> In the Exeter Domesday the bulk of the marginal and postscriptal matter looks and reads as if it may have been derived from a stage late in the proceedings of the Inquest, and just possibly from documents distinct from the primary statistical "original returns", since it is chiefly concerned with additions to and ablations from manors, or failure to pay customary dues—in fact, the sort of matter which we find in *Terrae Occupatae*, and which perhaps was not available, or which needed the verdict of authority, at the moment that the main text was being inscribed.

Nothing more than the production of a fair copy seems to have been the aim of the authors of "Little Domesday". There is no evidence, as there is on almost every folio of the Exeter Domesday, that the text was systematically checked, and in which many

<sup>1</sup> "The Making of Domesday Book", p. 166 ff.; *Studies in the Public Records*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. in *Colecestra* (11), *Bummesteda* (28b), *Newelanda* (31), *Rodinges* (49).



errors were underscored and corrected.<sup>1</sup> The interruption of the Norfolk ecclesiastical fiefs by the lands of lay holders suggests that the clerks were at no particular pains to reshape the material available.

No index to the Exeter Domesday booklets survives, and it is doubtful if one ever existed. There is on fol. 532 a short list of fiefs, but it is markedly incomprehensive, and the twenty-seven sections it names are in no sort of logical order.<sup>2</sup> It is probable, however, that the inscription of the word *Cornubia* at the head of certain booklets was done in order that those appropriate to this county could be readily collected. The Essex and East Anglian Domesday has the name of the county at the head of left-hand pages, and that of the appropriate fief on the right. It is prefaced by an index of the landholders concerned, and it may be that the original draft from which it was made was in the form of loose booklets, each containing a number of fiefs, or a portion of a large one, as was the Exeter Domesday. Such booklets may have borne on their initial leaves a contents list of the fiefs they contained; the deleted indexes of fiefs on fols. 9 and 17 rather suggest that they may have been unthinkingly copied by the transcriber, since if there was to be a general index and the work as a whole stitched together, they would be unnecessary, and were perhaps accordingly struck through.<sup>3</sup> Fols. 292, 372 (Suffolk) also contain similar lists of fiefs.

An additional hint that Little Domesday is a copy of an earlier document is to be found in the fact that twice sheets have been inserted in the quaternions, "suggesting a copying

<sup>1</sup> I have noticed two passages in the Essex section which suggest a possible check: large marginal crosses against *Hacuuella* (51b) and *Phenna* (63) suggest that the transcribing clerk or a supervisor may have seen that these entries were virtual duplicates of what had just previously been inscribed for *Hechuuella* (50a) and *Fenne* (62a). Two whole Norfolk entries, on fols. 267a, b, have been underscored: someone must have noticed they had been included in the wrong fief.

<sup>2</sup> It does indeed begin with the royal demesne, and the lands of the late queen follow. But the widow of Eustace of Boulogne comes next, and though the lands of Bishop Odo were in the same booklet as the end of those of the Bishop of Coutances, Odo is unmentioned. It does not look as if it was made by consultation of the *original* booklets, for the four Abbeys represented in booklet h come in an order different from that in this booklet, with Bath Abbey, from 2g, intervening.

<sup>3</sup> It is suggestive of a booklet form for the draft that the first list covers the contents of eight leaves.

omission made good by an insertion".<sup>1</sup> Another is that blank spaces, which might have been left unfilled because what should occupy them was, at the time of inscription of the surrounding matter, unavailable, are few, as are the instances of compression of the material added by way of postscript or interlineation, the need for which is commonly obviously due to the information these give not being to hand.<sup>2</sup> Only in a dozen places is Essex matter (usually no more than a word or a figure) carried over from what should have been the last line of a folio or an entry to save wastage of almost an entire line or turning matter over to a fresh page. This too suggests that the clerks were producing an unchanged copy of a record in which they could plainly see what was still to come.

It seems probable that the material of the Exchequer Domesday was not invariably inscribed in the order in which it appears in the record, but all divergencies from the normal must be considered in relation to the material from which they were derived. The absence of cross-heads, or their insertion marginally or in spaces inadequate for them, suggest that in the drafts those landowners concerned were not accorded independent sections. The material of the entries regarding them may have been what we find in the Exeter Domesday from fol. 456 onwards. A series of examples occurs in the Wiltshire section, beginning with the land of Bernard Pancevolt.<sup>3</sup>

Many, if not all, of the indexes of tenants-in-chief appear to be late work. So often they fail to harmonize with the order of arrangement of the text that we are entitled to deduce, first, that the rubricated cross-heads, the inclusion of which would have made the work of compiling an accurate index easy, had not been inscribed, or were incomplete, when many indexes were made; secondly, many, if not all, of the transcripts from which the Exchequer clerks worked, probably included no contents lists.

<sup>1</sup> "Domesday Re-bound" (H.M.S.O., 1952, p. 42). The same pamphlet suggests (p. 43) that "the use of special Rulings on the three pages containing the List of Contents of each County is a noteworthy mark of orderly procedure in drafting—or perhaps . . . in the making of a fair copy".

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> 72b2, and succeeding entries to the end of 73a2.

If the lands in several shires were *not* kept distinct, selection of the fiefs appropriate to the individual county would be the more difficult, and might result in initial omissions, which might be reflected in the indexing.

The Kent index comes on fol. 2a2, not, as we should expect, on 1a, as though the accounts of Dover and Canterbury and "the possessions of St. Martin" and his Canons were already inscribed when it was written. The Berkshire index on 56ai is very much cramped, and a space is left before it; so is that for Warwickshire on 238ai, and it overflows into the second column. In Dorset insufficient vertical room was left for even a two-column index—obviously the rest of 75a was already inscribed—and from the 52nd entry the numbers and names spread right across the folio. Alfred *Hispaniensis* was omitted from it; this threw out the numbering, and to restore the congruence, Iseldis, no. 55 in the Index, was given no heading or number in the text, though room had been left for these. William of Mohun's land is numbered 25 in the Somerset index, but 21 in the text (that of Roger of Courseulles is also numbered 21 in the text, and 22-24 follow it). xxv might easily be misread as xxi. The correspondence remains imperfect until the 45th section. To adjust matters after an earlier mistake, no section of the text was numbered XL in the Devonshire Domesday. These are but a small selection of failures by the clerks to harmonize the Indexes with the text.<sup>1</sup> In addition, there is frequent lack of verbal congruence, or identity of subject, between index and textual headings.

*Terra Regis* may often have been inserted in the Exchequer Domesday after matter succeeding it was already inscribed. The accounts of it often suggest that they are the product of a special feudal return as well as (or in place of) hundredal returns; a Somerset entry adds to the name of the pre-Conquest holder of *Modiforda* (116) the words *testimonio breve regis*. Perhaps the material for the King's lands was not always available to the Exchequer clerks when they began to inscribe the account of a shire; perhaps it received a special checking, in the provinces or at Winchester. The space on 2b2, with the Archbishop of

<sup>1</sup> In Leicestershire Earl Hugh is No. 13 in the Index, 43 in the text—see *V.C.H. : Leics.*, i. 298.

Canterbury's fief beginning on 3, suggests that the whole of 2b, which proved to be more than ample space to contain the account of the King's estates, was originally left blank for it, and that some succeeding portions of the Kent material were inscribed before it was completed. The gap on 172bi suggests that the same thing happened in compiling the Worcestershire section; so does the Nottinghamshire account, where the whole of 282a2 is blank.

But the appearance of later folios in each section of Domesday Book is even more suggestive. For Wiltshire, only a single Exeter Domesday entry survives, and so here we shall not be influenced by the aspect of an earlier draft. The passages which end 64bi, which mostly have to do with boroughs and quasi-boroughs, and which are in a hand different from that which wrote the account of the borough of Malmesbury above them, were obviously written after the rest of the leaf, which includes the index and the opening of *Terra Regis*, and presumably certain succeeding leaves also, was inscribed, for at the end the matter spreads right across both columns.<sup>1</sup> The notes about churches, closing the account of *Terra Regis* (65bi), are in a hand unlike that of the entry above them; the "*Fac.*" below, opposite the beginning of the Bishop of Winchester's fief, might be an instruction to a clerk there to open the account of his lands, thus leaving space for the addition later of these notes. We may think with reason that the closely-written account of the estates of the Bishop of Lisieux, which ends the second column of 66a, was not inserted until 66b, or the beginning of it, had been inscribed.<sup>2</sup> The final entries in the first column of 68b, which is appreciably longer than the second, look like afterthoughts, and obviously both the manor of Hugh de Baldric and two of Aldred's were at first missed, since they had to be written in right across the foot of both columns of 73a and 73b, which presumably were already

<sup>1</sup> We may well wonder why the Wiltshire Domesday begins on a dorso. Were the clerks expecting to receive more material, perhaps about boroughs? It might be that only the *Terra Regis* portion of 64b was already written, and that the clerks felt the burghal material might fill 64a and 64bi.

<sup>2</sup> What we have already seen suggests that it may have been overlooked, because concealed within a booklet, or lacking a clear cross-heading.



complete.<sup>1</sup> But the most curious entry is that on 72b2 for a hide in *Coleselle* (a Berkshire vill, though the holding may have been geographically and fiscally in Wiltshire), which is certainly postscriptal, for it has nothing to do with the preceding two lines, which carry over the account of *Segrie* from 72b2 to 73ai.<sup>2</sup> From the length of 72bi, it looks as if the last, or last two, entries for Roger of Berkeley had also been postscriptal, though probably made earlier than that for *Coleselle*, and that when the clerk found an entry, one of the holders named in which was Roger of Lacy, he put it in as close as he could to those of the other Rogers and persons whose initial was R, maintaining an alphabetical principle strongly apparent, though imperfectly followed, in much of the whole Exchequer Domesday. The owners of *Coleselle* do not appear in the index on 64bi, and as this includes, in their proper order, all the tenants-in-chief except those inserted late on 68bi, who have nothing to do with the previous heading, that for the Canons of Lisieux, the index and the Coleshill entry are presumably late work.

The Exchequer account of Dorset includes two holdings which are not in the surviving booklets (e,f) of the Exeter Domesday which cover *Terra Regis*. This suggests that they were in a separate booklet in the copy sent to Winchester, or raised problems to which a solution could not be given when *Terra Regis* was being transcribed. For *Melcome*, the account of which looks like a postscript, squeezed in at the end of *Terra Regis* on 75b2 in characters smaller than the normal, had been taken away from Shaftesbury Abbey by Harold Godwineson, and so may not have been in any *breve* for the royal lands originally. *Hinetone*, which had been Gytha's, was for some reason at first missed: obviously when the clerk wanted to inscribe it there was no room to do so at the end of *Terra Regis*, and the lands of the Bishop of Salisbury had already been recorded at the end of 75b2 and on 77ai, 2.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, a fresh sheet,

<sup>1</sup> Postscripts so inserted suggest that the clerks were trying to keep as far as possible to a pre-determined order of fiefs.

<sup>2</sup> The *in Coleselle* entry is unrubricated, and may thus have been among the very latest entries.

<sup>3</sup> Part of Melcombe had been Gytha's: it looks as if a section of the Exeter Domesday concerned with her property and Harold's ablation was initially overlooked.

76, had to be inserted, interrupting the continuity of the Bishop's estates, with a mark here and on 75b2 to show where it should have gone. The clerk also failed to notice the solitary manor of Baldwin, Sheriff of Devonshire, and most of the lands of William of Mohun. Again a new folio, 81, had to be inserted into the text, which shows that matter beyond this point had already been inscribed. On the front is Baldwin's manor; on the back, and in a script unlike that for the rest of his lands, the omitted manors of William of Mohun. But why he should have omitted them originally is a mystery, for the first entry missed (*Poleham*) is on the same Exeter folio (47b) as the last one correctly inscribed on 82ai. It rather suggests that the copy of the Exeter Domesday which the Exchequer clerks were presumably using was not the same, folio for folio, as the surviving Exeter Domesday. Baldwin's manor is so far from its proper place, which would be 82bi, that it may be an addition later than those for William of Mohun. The Dorset Domesday, according to the numbering of fiefs, includes a good deal which is postscriptal.<sup>1</sup>

For Somerset and Devonshire the errors are fewer. Matter originally omitted had to be crammed in on 86bi and 87a2; postscripts are also discernible on 92a, b, 93a, 95ai, 98bi, 102a2, 103ai, 117bi, for example. It is curious, since in the copying of the Exeter Domesday postscripts and *marginalia* might have been put into their proper place, that often what is postscriptal or marginal in the Exeter version is postscriptal also in the Exchequer text.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g. the *Chingestone* and in *Ferneham* postscripts, *Povertone* (80bi), Hugh de Port's manor (83a2). *Povertone* is an interesting late entry: the clerk marked it for insertion, not at the end of the account of the fief, but next to a manor in the same Hundred as that in which it is; that is, presumably, in its Exeter Domesday order. The lands of the widow of Eustace of Boulogne were probably overlooked; in Somerset these are among the lands of the *comites*, and though the position of appearance of the *comitissae* varies in Domesday Book, she should not have been relegated to the very end, save for three *servientes regis* also overlooked, as she is here. Her fief was at the end of booklet f in the Exeter Domesday, after the late Queen's lands (whom she follows also in the general Exeter index), and so may not have been discovered until almost all the Exchequer text had been inscribed.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. the addition of *Baldrintone* to *Raweberge*, 102a2, 124b. But I suspect that the copy of the Exeter Domesday may have been made as soon as the original was inscribed, possibly entry by entry, or at least Hundred by Hundred. This, if so, would explain many oddities; postscripts may have been added to the original after the main entry had been copied.

It is obvious that 87bi was not all inscribed at one time, or by a single clerk; the first two manors of the Bishop of Salisbury on 87b2 are differently spaced, and probably in a different hand, from that of the third. The account of Thurstan fitzRou's manor on 115b2 looks as if it was not written by the clerk who continued the column, and the space left before it is unusually generous. Aiulf's two manors on 116a2 are either postscriptal, or crammed in so as not to run over to the back of the sheet. The clerks missed the Tavistock lands in Cornwall until they had inscribed all the rest of the ecclesiastical land, and the large gap on 121bi looks as if they were afraid they might later discover other omissions, for which they left space.<sup>1</sup> It appears, too, as if the script sometimes changes when the lands of a fresh sub-tenant of Robert of Mortain are reached, e.g. on 123ai, 123b2, and 124ai, 2, while a space was left after his demesne manors on 122a2.

The most interesting afterthought is that for *Ulvredintone* (Werrington). It should have come on 101ai, but it was inserted, late, on 101a2, with marks to indicate its proper position. Since Werrington is the manor of which the *barones regis* disseized the Abbot of Tavistock, and which seems to be the final addition to *Terra Regis* on fol. 98 of the Exeter Domesday, it is quite possible that it was not accidentally omitted, but that the clerk had to enquire where to include it. We have to remember that the Exchequer clerks were not merely copying; they were omitting, contracting, and re-ordering material also. This would account for some errors, and what appear to be omissions may have been caused because the clerk did not know how to proceed without instructions, and continued with other material until these were given. The eccentricities intensify the impression gained, first that the copy of the Exeter Domesday was not in a form in which the material had been separated into counties, except by

<sup>1</sup> The Tavistock lands, in the Exeter Domesday, are in booklet 2n, together with the Abbey's Devonshire fief, and as they do not come at the beginning of a booklet, it is possible that, in the absence of an index, they were at first missed through being concealed within it. They are numbered iii on 121a2, showing they should have come, taking their proper precedence, after the Bishop of Exeter's fief (ii) on 120bi,2. The first fief of those which precedes them is numbered iiii, but the first i is a black postscript to an original red iii, showing that when it was inscribed, Tavistock was forgotten.

sub-headings, and secondly that it was, like its predecessor, in the form of loose booklets, but with the composition of these perhaps slightly altered.

Now a reason for the inscription of the account of each shire in the Exchequer Domesday in an order different from that in which the fiefs appear would be this, if the material was in booklet form. With the account of a fief covering several shires in a single booklet, its transcription could be effected only for a single shire at any moment. With the lands of more than one man contained in a single booklet, the separate accounts of their lands could not be simultaneously inscribed. Since the hand-writings of the Exchequer Domesday indicate the employment of more than one clerk for the account of a single shire, and probably the delegation of shires in the same group to different clerks, difficulties, unless the work was to be extravagantly prolonged, would arise. Thus, though the order of appearance of fiefs was surely pre-determined, to inscribe them throughout in that order would be either impossible or uneconomic of time. So, it would seem, the clerks were sometimes forced to calculate the space to be left for the ultimate inscription of a fief or fiefs. This was no easy matter ; for though the amount of space occupied in their source could be seen, it had to be compressed and reduced in accordance with pre-determined principles. Thus at times insufficient space was left for the inscription of a fief or fiefs ; often (especially in northern or midland shires), the clerk seems to have played for safety and begun a new folio or column, in consequence leaving far more room than was ultimately required for the record of a fief on which at that moment he was unable to work. Moreover, unless the task was most carefully and methodically performed, and a full index made before it was begun, it would be most difficult to determine from the provincial record all the sections necessary ; it would be easy to overlook the need for including, to close the account of the *Terra Regis* or to intervene between the major ecclesiastical lands and those of the lay tenants, those holdings connected with churches on royal estates, of minor clerics and those ecclesiastics who had only one or two properties within a shire, or tenancies in frankalmoign, and we can by consulting the facsimiles of Domesday Book see the



difficulties these caused. The separation of the lands of those minor tenants grouped in a single section in a provincial record would also prove fruitful of error. The authors of *Domesday Re-bound* suggest that experience derived from compiling the accounts of the southern counties caused the Exchequer clerks to leave room at the end of the account of a fief for the insertion of subsequent discoveries or matter, the need for inscription of which was not immediately determined. It was the normal custom, in writing "Little Domesday", to leave considerable space between fiefs, which sometimes proved wise, and permitted the easy addition of a postscript without using the margin, e.g. on 427b.

The Yorkshire-Lincolnshire section of Domesday Book is among the most illuminating of potential clues to the making thereof. Inspection will demonstrate how many folios and columns are blank, as though the sections, of whatever category, were inscribed in an order quite unlike that of their present appearance, and many originally altogether independently of their neighbours.<sup>1</sup>

*fol.*

295a-6b*	blank (297a, b is also blank)
298ab	City of York, and Index of Tenants
299-332a2	Yorkshire Domesday (for all three Ridings)
332bi-333ai	Fee of Robert Bruce (not contemporary)
333b-5b	blank
336ai-337a2	City of Lincoln, Borough of Stamford, in <i>Torchesey</i> , possessors of sac and soc, Index of Tenants
337bi-371bi	Lincolnshire Domesday (for all three Ridings)
372a, b*	blank
373ai-374a2	<i>Clamores</i> of Yorkshire
374b	blank
375ai-377b2	Lincolnshire <i>clamores</i>
378a, b	blank
379ai-381ai	Yorkshire "index" by wapentakes
381a2	Index and Summary of Count Alan's land
381bi-382a2	Yorkshire "index" by Hundreds

<sup>1</sup> Those marked \* are leaves at the end of gatherings. In addition, 313b, 318b, and 382b are blank folios. Most of the final entries of sections do not complete columns; sometimes a whole column (e.g. 314b2) is blank.

The absence of certain material for which space was left might be due to the fact that it was unavailable when required, to postponements of the task for some indeterminable reason, or to misconceptions. The inscription of the accounts of towns such as London and Winchester may have been postponed, or the originals thereof may not have reached the Exchequer; the inspiration of the survey may have departed before this work was put in hand. The clerk or supervisor may have known that in Somerset was the borough of Bath, and left space for it at the start, ignorant that an account of it had been or would be inscribed within the body of the work.

But the blanks and spaces to which reference has been made above may be caused by the character of the Exeter Domesday, and, as has been argued, of the construction of all the Exchequer Domesday from documents of similar type. Suppose—which is probable enough—two clerks were at work simultaneously on Somerset and Devonshire. According to the plan laid down for him, the former should next inscribe the lands of Ralph of Pomeroy. But he is unable to do this, for the booklet (3s) in which they are is in use by the clerk inscribing Devonshire. Either he must wait until the booklet is available, or he must continue with another fief, and must either depart from a logical or agreed order or calculate how much space to leave for it, which implies an interruption while he examines the relevant booklet or consults an alternative source for the information, perhaps (if it was available) a list of the manors concerned. When the gap comes to be filled, he may not be at work, and so the account of this fief will appear in a script different from that which prefaces it. He may also miscalculate, resulting in a blank space or the need for over-compression of the material. It would be easy to forget that a missing fief ought to be inscribed at a particular point, and fill the space left for it, with the result that when it was inserted, it had to be done in the wrong place or across both columns at the foot of a leaf, which quite frequently happened. Possibly at times the agreed or the logical order was abandoned, owing to the impossibility of immediately inscribing the fief which should come next. In determining the order, a vaguely alphabetical principle was often employed. So, after Roger of

Courseulles and Roger Arundel, we might in Somerset expect to find others whose Christian names begin with R. But we do not; we pass to some whose names begin with W. It may be that when dealing with Walter Giffard, who comes in the middle of booklet 4q, the clerk noticed the name of Ralph of Mortemer in the same booklet, and accordingly went back to the R's.

The somewhat illogical order towards the end might be the result of the requisite booklet being in use elsewhere. After dealing with only two of the *Franci Tegni*, the clerks moved to the *Servientes Regis*, whose lands were in a different booklet, bringing together the lands of an individual tenant scattered in the Exeter Domesday, but not giving each a heading.<sup>1</sup> It looks as if subsequently it was discovered that the *Franci Tegni* were not finished with, but not until the *Angli Taini* had been dealt with. All this does not suggest careful planning, or the construction of an inflexible and logical order for all the fiefs.

Devonshire was more adequately done—but then Exeter lies within it. After the obvious initial laymen, Baldwin of Exeter and Juhel of Totnes, the clerks recorded the W's, even extracting the lands of William of Eu from the *Franci Tegni* section in booklet 4t. They naturally inscribed the lands of Goscelm immediately after those of his brother Walter de Claville, since in the Exeter Domesday these had formed a single section, and then set down the fiefs of ten tenants whose initial was R. On 115ai-117ai we can see an alphabetical principle at work, and in separating into individual sections the lands of the four *arbalistarii* and transcribing the remaining entries for the *Franci Milites* and those for the *Angli Tegni* they worked almost faultlessly, bringing the lands of the individual together and preserving the Exeter Domesday's order of manors. But (supposing it was in the copy they were using) they altogether missed Floher's manor of *Sotrebroc*.

There is in addition an aspect of the Exchequer Domesday as a whole which suggests that its text was not altogether inscribed in the same order as that in which it now appears. It looks as if

<sup>1</sup> The work was imperfectly done; e.g. they failed to include with Humfrey the Chamberlain's other lands those recorded in the Exeter Domesday's section for *Franci Tegni*.

portions were inscribed as proved convenient to their authors, and ultimately brought together as could best be done into a pre-arranged but at times illogical order. Fol. 5b2 is in part left blank ; the Kentish fief of the Bishop of Baieux begins on 6ai, as though it was inscribed independently of the portion now preceding it. The Sussex text looks as if the accounts of at least some fiefs, for a number begin new pages, were not inscribed in the order of the index. We find the same feature in the portions relating to Herefordshire and Huntingdonshire, and in those four northern shires characterized by the six-carucate unit—Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire.<sup>1</sup> In the west midland shires we can find copious indications of a possibility that the accounts of the various fiefs were not inscribed in the order in which they now appear. In the Staffordshire Domesday, for example, the account of the Bishop of Chester's lands occupies all the first column of 247a, and two-thirds of the second column. There was plenty of room to inscribe there the single Westminster Abbey manor and those of Bishop Remigius, or part of the Burton Abbey estates, but these were all inscribed on 247bi. Again, the normal appearance on 250bi of the fee of Richard the Forester and the beginning of the account of Nigel's land, compared with the compressed account of *Niwetone*, suggests that the transcription of the two fees mentioned, and perhaps that of Ralph fitzHubert which immediately precedes Nigel's, was made before that for Rainald de Bailleul which precedes them, and that the inscription of this was performed before the land of Richard the Forester, which begins the folio, was entered. Yet, unless the end of the account of Nigel's land is postscriptal, the record for the King's Thegns which almost fills column two of this folio must already have been inscribed, for Nigel's fief overflows into the foot of it.

We find similar evidence in the accounts of so many shires. There is a large space left on 238bi between the fiefs of the

<sup>1</sup> Note the large space blank on 20a2, with the Mortain fief beginning 20bi (Sussex), and that of 250a2 (Staffordshire). The accounts of fiefs in Herefordshire often deliberately open a new column (e.g. Ralph de Tosni's, 183a2, Roger de Lacy's, 184ai). Nottinghamshire provides many examples (283a, 284ai ; 282a2, bi ; 287ai, 2 ; 288a2, bi.). So do Yorkshire and Lincolnshire ; see in particular 314b2, 315ai ; 318b, 319ai ; 341b2, 342ai ; 345a2, 345bi.



Bishops of Chester and Worcester. 238b2 (Warwickshire) suggests that the land of the Bishop of Coutances was squeezed in after the preceding and succeeding accounts were inscribed ; in view of the fact that his Oxfordshire lands were included in the Northamptonshire Domesday, I suspect that the lateness of this entry was caused by delayed discovery on the part of the Exchequer clerks that he possessed land in Warwickshire. I doubt very much, from the spacing and caligraphy, if all of 239a was written at one and the same time. Why, if inscription was done in the order of the index, should there be that gigantic and unusual blank space between the single manor of Roger of Ivri and that of Roger d'Oyly on 242a2, or the spacing between fiefs be so uneven on 243b2 ? The account of the Church of Worcester's land (172b) was obviously not written all at once or by the same hand ; on 174a2 the lands of four minor churches are crammed in either because they were originally overlooked or because the remainder of the folio was already inscribed. We see the same feature on 182b2 (Herefordshire), and opposite, a large gap at the end of Nigel's land which could have been filled by entries such as those on 185a2, two of which were surely not written after Roger de Laci's fief which precedes them was inscribed. We can see great inequality of spacing between fiefs on 186b and 187a, and the appearance of 183b is extraordinary : we begin with the seven final lines of Ralph of Tosni's fief, then comes an unusually large space before that of Ralph of Mortemer is begun, and this continues into the second column, almost all the lower half of which is blank. The Shropshire index (252ai) bears small relation to the Domesday text ; the ecclesiastical lands on 252b, 253ai do not appear in it, and apart from a misplaced entry,<sup>1</sup> it is obviously unlikely that the various sections were inscribed in the order of appearance. The single holding of St. Juliana must be postscriptal ; it may easily have been overlooked in the text from which our Domesday was made. Nor does 260b look as if it was consecutively inscribed.

The accounts of some shires, however (e.g. Hertfordshire, Middlesex), look as if they were inscribed in order without space ever being left for the later addition of whole fiefs. But the

<sup>1</sup> Brunfelde, see *V.C.H. : Shropshire*, p. 313, n.17.

forty-second and subsequent sections of the former, which follow the lands of the thegns, must be a postscript.

These conclusions, though given here in somewhat greater detail, are in general similar to those at which the authors of "Domesday Re-bound" arrived. They suggested that unruddicated paragraphs at the foot of columns were "not only . . . additions but . . . constituted a second series not added until after the whole work was done". This further suggests, as do occasional additions to the text in uncommon hands, and sometimes the marginal reminders that information must be sought out, that the Exchequer Domesday was checked and edited, if not altogether successfully, perhaps because of the urgency of the work which the text and arrangement everywhere demonstrate, and because it is so obviously uncompleted work. They argue that blank spaces, ultimately sometimes unfilled, sometimes partially filled, and sometimes dealt with only by severe compression of the script, were left "because further information was expected to accrue", and that this practice, most marked after the first eight counties dealt with, was "adopted as the result of experience."<sup>1</sup>

The results as a whole give every indication that they are the result of the use of documents comparable to the Exeter Domesday, unindexed, incomplete, often difficult to understand in the absence of supplementary information, and semi-professional in character, often transcribed literally and without overmuch thought. The construction of the Exchequer Domesday is a subject which still demands intensive study, and its contents, viewed in the light of their sources, should be considered with more caution than has been customary.

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 27-8. The compilers did not have to make insertions on extra pieces of parchment after fol. 82.

#### NOTE

Preliminary work on the Essex Domesday, the results of which I hope to publish before long, suggest very strongly that it is a copy of a document of 'Exeter Domesday' type, and inscribed while the original was being compiled.

## THE HOUSEHOLD OF QUEEN MARGARET OF ANJOU, 1452-3

By A. R. MYERS, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A.

SENIOR LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

THE Account Book printed below is of particular interest for at least two reasons: for the light it throws on the financial and political situation of the time and for the information it gives about the organization of the queen's household in the fifteenth century. It is of especial value, since the form in which it is constructed and the unusual wealth of detail that it provides make it more informative than the other extant household accounts of this century. But its worth is increased by the fact that so few of the household accounts of the fifteenth-century queens of England have survived. There are only two accounts of Queen Joan extant, none of Queen Catherine, no other of Queen Margaret, and only one of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville<sup>1</sup>; only one of these is the account of a queen-consort—Elizabeth—and not merely of a queen-dowager, and none is both as balanced and as informative as this account of Queen Margaret.

<sup>1</sup> (a) Queen Joan's household accounts both dated from the reign of Henry V when she was only a queen-dowager, living comfortably but in captivity: Exchequer Accounts 406 30 for the period 1 October to 15 December 1419, and Rylands Latin MS. 238 for the period 17 March 1420 to 7 March 1421, published by the present writer, *BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY* vol. 24, pp. 263-84; vol. 26, pp. 82-100

(b) Queen Elizabeth Wydeville: Exchequer Treasury of the Receipt, Misc. Books No. 207. This account was transcribed by a former pupil of the present writer, Mr. D. H. Jones, M.A., in an unpublished thesis, entitled "A Household Account of Queen Elizabeth Woodville" and presented to the University of Liverpool in 1949.

One may also mention here the account of the household of Queen Elizabeth of York for the period 24 March 1502 to 3 March 1503 (Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt, Misc. Books 210, published by N. H. Nicolas in *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York*, London, 1830). This account illustrates the point made above; that Queen Margaret's account best combines balance and information. Queen Elizabeth's account-book gives particulars of daily expenditure and supplies more details of costs than Queen Margaret's; but its information about receipts is comparatively slight, and the account as a whole is less balanced and digested in form.

Mrs. M. A. Everett-Wood briefly drew attention to its interest and value as long ago as 1846<sup>1</sup>; but it does not appear to have been used by any of the biographers of the queen and has hitherto remained unpublished.

It is well known with what degree of poverty and financial disorder the Lancastrian monarchy was struggling by the reign of Henry VI; yet the resources provided for his queen were on a lavish scale from the first. In 1433 Lord Cromwell, the Treasurer of England, had estimated the net income from the crown lands at only £8,399 19s. 11d.<sup>2</sup>; and Mr. A. B. Steel has calculated that in the 1440's the average amount of cash actually reaching the Exchequer each year was only £9,907 11s. 7½d.<sup>3</sup> Yet a sum of £5,129 2s. could be provided to bring Henry's bride into England in 1445;<sup>4</sup> and next year parliament was induced to assign as her dowry £3,000 a year from the Duchy of Lancaster and £3,666 13s. 4d. a year in cash from other sources.<sup>5</sup> It is true that this total of 10,000 marks was based on precedent. Queen Joan had received a dowry of this sum on her marriage to Henry IV in 1403<sup>6</sup>, and a dowry of the same amount was guaranteed to Queen Catherine by the Treaty of Troyes, which added that the queens of England were wont to enjoy such a dowry.<sup>7</sup> But in the

<sup>1</sup> M. A. Everett-Wood, *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain*, i (London, 1846), 97-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot[uli] Parl[iamentorum]*, iv (London, 1777), 435.

<sup>3</sup> A. B. Steel, *The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1377-1485* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 216-34.

<sup>4</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 23,938, "Compotus Johannis Breknoke et Johannis Euerdon de expensis domine Margarete Regine venientis in Angliam", fol. 62; *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry the Sixth*, ed. J. Stevenson, i (London, 1861), 448.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 118-20. £2,000 was to come from Duchy of Lancaster estates assigned to her, £1,000 from a cash annuity to be drawn from Duchy of Lancaster estates, and £3,666 13s. 4d. from customs, the Duchy of Cornwall, and the royal Exchequer.

<sup>6</sup> *C[alendar of] P[atenti] R[olls]*, 1401-5, p. 213; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 532.

<sup>7</sup> Clause 3 of the Treaty of Troyes reads: "Item, concordatum est, quod praedicta carissima Filia nostra Katherina percipiet & habebit Dotem in Regno Angliae, quemadmodum Reginae Angliae hactenus percipere & habere consueverunt, videlicet, ad Summam Quadraginta Millium Scutorum annuatim; quorum Duo semper valeant unum Nobile Anglicanum" (T. Rymer, *Foedera*, etc. (Hague ed. 1740), iv. 2, p. 171). For the contemporary English version of this clause, see *ibid.* p. 179.



fourteenth century "£4,500 was the total often regarded by the convention of the time as a suitable dower"<sup>1</sup> for the queen consort; and in any case to fix the dowry in 1445 by traditional standards was a luxury which the royal finances could not afford. Margaret's successor, in a reign when the finances of the Crown were being restored to a healthier state, seems to have enjoyed a dowry of only about £4,750<sup>2</sup> in nominal value.

To be assigned a dowry of 10,000 marks was, however, one thing; to succeed in collecting this amount was a different matter. It has been said that in the fourteenth century "there was often grave discrepancy between the nominal value of the queen's possessions and the amount which actually reached her coffers"<sup>3</sup>; and this is particularly true of Queen Margaret's household. This account includes many items where she claims revenue but nothing has in fact been received for the year under review. Her income should by now have reached £7,000 a year; for on the sudden death of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, at Bury St. Edmunds in 1447, Margaret shared in the spoils of his possessions by taking an additional annuity of 500 marks from the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster.<sup>4</sup> At first sight her income for the year 31-32 Henry VI might appear to have not only equalled but exceeded this, for the total receipts amounted to £7,563 12s. 1d. But apart from the fact that £52 16s. 2d. of this was from a source not included in her dower,<sup>5</sup> the sum of £2,808 19s. 10½d., forming part of the "regular" income, was arrears from previous

<sup>1</sup> T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, v (Manchester, 1930), 281. As the essay in this volume on "The Queen's Household" is not by T. F. Tout but by Professor Hilda Johnstone, this source will henceforward be referred to as *Johnstone I*, to distinguish it from her second essay on "The Queen's Household" in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*, vol. i, ed. J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1940), which will be designated *Johnstone II*.

<sup>2</sup> Jones, op. cit. p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Johnstone I*, p. 282. Queen Catherine's income fell considerably short in fact of the 10,000 marks promised to her; a valor of 1432 shows a gross income of only £5,098 16s. 7d., or about 6,540 marks net income (R. Somerville, *A History of the Duchy of Lancaster*, i (London, 1953), 208).

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 133; cf. Rymer, op. cit. v. 1, p. 170 (24 February 1447).

<sup>5</sup> Queen's gold, to be dealt with later. See below, pp. 85-86 of the introduction, and fols. 8b-11a of the text.

years.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, many items were not received until after Michaelmas, 32 Henry VI, when the account was supposed to close.<sup>2</sup> The queen's revenues were thus by no means in such a healthy state as they seem at first sight. The total is both shrunk and swollen; shrunk by the lack of many items which her officials claimed but could not collect, and swollen by the inclusion of many items which should have been paid in a previous year—or, in a less important class, by forestalling revenue which should have been left to the following year's account.

The income of the queen's household was still derived from the same sources as in the fourteenth century. Then, the queen's revenues had come from dower lands, from supplementary grants in cash, and from queen's gold.<sup>3</sup> Each of these sources is still to be found in the account of Queen Margaret's household. First place is given to the income from her dower lands. In the Parliament of 1445-6 lands estimated to be worth in all £2,000 were assigned to her from the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster—especially the honours of Tutbury, Leicester, and Kenilworth, lands in Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, London, and Surrey, and the southern parts.<sup>4</sup> Many of these lands had been part of the dowries of fourteenth-century queens, and some were to be included amongst the dower lands of Margaret's successor.<sup>5</sup> The revenue from these lands seems to have come in comparatively well, a fact which will not surprise us, for the receiver-general

<sup>1</sup> £2,662 were arrears from the customs of Southampton, and £146 19s. 10½d. from the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall (below, fols. 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b). The arrears stretched as far back as the 25th year of Henry VI (fol. 6a).

<sup>2</sup> One item was not paid until 5 July, 32 Henry VI (below, fol. 1a); and although this was a special case, since the receiver in question (Robert Whitgreue) had died during the year of the account and the money had to be extracted from his executors, there are many other instances where the items were not received until January, February, March, or April, 32 Henry VI (below, fol. 1a-6b *passim*). No doubt they were included, nevertheless, to make the account solvent, since the expenses totalled £7,539 15s. 4¾d. (below, fol. 21b).

<sup>3</sup> *Johnstone II*, p. 253. For a definition of queen's gold see below, p. 85. References to treatises by William Prynne and William Hakewill on Aurum Reginae are to be found on p. 263 of *Johnstone II*.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 118-19.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. the High Peak, Haverford, Rockingham, Odiham, Gillingham, Plessaunce, Sheen, Queenhithe, Havering-at-Bower, Hadley, Radwell, etc. (*Johnstone II*, pp. 254, 258, 260; E36/207, fols. 1a-7b).

of the queen's revenues, William Cotton, was also the receiver-general of the Duchy. According to a long tradition, going back to 1354,<sup>1</sup> the receiver-general was also the treasurer of the queen's household.<sup>2</sup> The auditors of the account were also Duchy officials (one of them, John Walsh, being a Duchy auditor) and were therefore well placed to know whether the queen was receiving all her income from the Duchy. The Act of 1445-6 had also provided for a cash annuity of £1,000 from Duchy of Lancaster revenues ; and this, too, seems to have been paid promptly.<sup>3</sup>

In contrast to this efficient payment from the Duchy revenues is the dearth of income from a source granted to Margaret in 1447, the revenues of the earldom, shire, and lordship of Pembroke.<sup>4</sup> According to an inquisition of 20 May, 29 Henry VI, this source should have produced a net income of £400 2s. 8d. ; but although it had been assigned as part of the queen's dowry, it was taken into the king's hands by the act of resumption of 1450 and had been granted to Jasper, Earl of Pembroke.<sup>5</sup> The king promised that the queen should receive all arrears of income from the earldom of Pembroke, and assigned to her other revenues in compensation<sup>6</sup>; the manors and feefarms from which they are to come are named in this account.<sup>7</sup> But nothing had been received from them for the year under review, nor had the queen had any of the arrears of revenue from the earldom of Pembroke which had been reserved to her.<sup>8</sup>

Besides allocating revenues from the Duchy of Lancaster to her, the Act of Parliament of 1446 had assigned to the queen £1,000 from the customs of Southampton, £1,008 15s. 5d. from the issues of the Duchy of Cornwall, and £1,657 17s. 11d. from the royal Exchequer.<sup>9</sup> None of these sources had proved satisfactory to her, however. The revenue from the customs of Southampton seems to have slipped four years into arrears, and to have been paid in full for only one of those years.<sup>10</sup> The inadequacy of this source was largely due to the fact that

<sup>1</sup> *Johnstone I*, p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> Somerville, *op. cit.* pp. 209, 399 ; below, fol. 1a.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fol. 5a.

<sup>4</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 260b.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 260b-261b.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 261b-262a.

<sup>7</sup> Below, fol. 8a.

<sup>8</sup> Below, fol. 2b.

<sup>9</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 120.

<sup>10</sup> Below, fols. 5a, 6a, 6b.

parliament had in 1457 given priority to the payment of £20,000 from the customs of Southampton to the king from Christmas, 29 Henry VI, to Christmas, 31 Henry VI, with the result that she had received nothing during this period. Therefore it was enacted in the Parliament of 1453-4 that she should have the arrears of the £1,000 annual grant, and that in future this sum should be a first charge on the customs of Southampton.<sup>1</sup> The payments from the Duchy of Cornwall had been no better. Most of the sums due had remained unpaid, and of the £1,008 15s. 5d. owed for the current year the queen's treasurer had received only £386 19s. 8½d.<sup>2</sup> But the most difficult source of all seems to have been the royal Exchequer. Over a period of four years, 28-32 Henry VI, it should have provided Queen Margaret's household with £6,631 11s. 8d. According to this account it had furnished her with merely £1,037 5s. 1d. for the year under review, and then not in ready cash but by the method of tallies or other assignments on the issues and profits of various manors, lordships, and fee-farms.<sup>3</sup> The royal revenues were by this time in such a bad state that it would be extremely surprising if William Cotton had not found many of the tallies wholly or partially worthless, because the particular item of revenue had already been paid out to another creditor ; and such proved to be the case.<sup>4</sup> For the many uncollected items of the queen's revenue, her treasurer could only record the claims for the current and previous years, in the rather forlorn hope that the Exchequer might be able to pay the outstanding balances in future years. The unhappy experiences of Queen Margaret in her attempts to collect assignments on royal revenue may have helped to convince the government of Edward IV, in its effort at financial retrenchment and reform, that it was better not to make any grants of this kind to the queen. At any rate Queen Elizabeth's sole surviving account-book shows no revenue, or claims for revenue, from such a source ; though her receiver apparently succeeded in collecting a much higher proportion of her smaller nominal income.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Parl.* v. 258b-259b.

<sup>2</sup> Below, fol. 6a.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fol. 8a.

<sup>4</sup> Below, fols. 6b-8a.

<sup>5</sup> Apart from the claim made by both queens to queen's gold, Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's income appears to have been drawn entirely from lands and



Both queens, like their fourteenth-century predecessors, maintained their claim to queen's gold, "a sum accruing automatically to the queen consort when anybody entered into a voluntary obligation or fine with her husband, reckoned at one-tenth the value of such fine, but payable in addition to it".<sup>1</sup> Queen's gold had long been hard to collect, partly because those liable to pay it were sometimes unaware of their obligations, partly they were often unwilling to make this further payment in addition to their fine, and partly because it was not easy to draw the line between voluntary and compulsory fines. This prerogative, probably as old as the reign of Henry I, had needed watchful attention in the reign of Henry II<sup>2</sup>; fourteenth-century queens had met with much opposition to their claims<sup>3</sup>; and in the next reign it was to be regarded as an intolerable imposition.<sup>4</sup> But whereas there was to be delay in payment of queen's gold in only two cases in Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's household account,<sup>5</sup> in that of Queen Margaret most of the items of queen's gold actually received had been paid after a delay not only of months but of years, and in the great majority of instances it had so far been impossible to exact any payment.<sup>6</sup> This section of the account, on the 'Aurum Reginae', confirms the impression derived from

fee-farms. Her total actual income for the year 6-7 Edward IV was approximately £4,540 (the treasurer did not add up the items of revenues, but the auditors made the total £4,540 18s. 11½d., E36/207, p. 17) as compared with the £7,500 collected by Queen Margaret's receiver; but, as was pointed out above, nearly £3,000 of Queen Margaret's income for the year 31-32 Henry VI consisted of arrears, whereas nearly all the payments to Queen Elizabeth's household seem to have been for current income.

<sup>1</sup> *Johnstone II*, p. 263. Cf. the definition given in Queen Margaret's account (below, fol. 8b).

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. C. Johnson (London, 1950), pp. 122-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Johnstone I*, p. 226; *Johnstone II*, p. 263-4.

<sup>4</sup> *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley, p. 208 and note on p. 430.

<sup>5</sup> For queen's gold from William Canynges Queen Elizabeth had had to wait only a few months; for the payment from the Prior of Bridlington there had been a delay of about 18 months (E36/207, p. 15; *C.P.R. 1461-1467*, pp. 433, 496).

<sup>6</sup> Payments of queen's gold included in this account had arisen from fines made to the king more than five years earlier (e.g. below, fols. 9a, 10a); and unpaid claims were included on fines made as far back as 1445 and 1446 (below, fols. 8b, 10a). Of the fifty-nine claims recorded in this account, forty-three remained unpaid.

earlier sections of the receipts, that the queen's servants were experiencing great difficulty in collecting her revenues, but displaying tenacity (probably by her orders) in maintaining her claims to them. The number of claims for queen's gold, and the length of time over which Margaret's treasurer was pursuing them, contrast markedly with the fewness of the claims included in Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's account and the brief period which they cover.<sup>1</sup> This tenacity is in keeping with what is already known of the Queen. Whenever the arrangements for the queen's dower had to be altered, care was taken to try to ensure that she should not lose by the change<sup>2</sup>; and numerous instances are to be found of the reservation of income to the queen when royal revenues were assigned to the royal household or acts of resumption were passed.<sup>3</sup> A study of Margaret's revenues confirms the impression of her as a woman eager for power and ever watchful to gain and to keep all the income she could,<sup>4</sup> especially in view of the difficulty she experienced in collecting many items of her nominal revenue. In 1449 we find her securing a parliamentary confirmation of a royal licence to her to ship wools elsewhere than to Calais<sup>5</sup>; but if this, or any other money-making schemes, brought in any additional income, it did not help the finances of her household in the year reviewed in the account.

As the income of Queen Margaret's household is typical in its weakness of the revenues of the Lancastrian monarchy in this period, so the outgoings are characteristic in their lavishness. The liberality of the expenditure where Queen Margaret was concerned had been in evidence even before she reached England. The estimates for the cost of bringing her to England included provision for fifty-six ships to transport her and her household, and

<sup>1</sup> Queen Margaret's account includes fifty-nine, stretching back nearly eight years (below, fols. 8b-11a); Queen Elizabeth's account has only eleven claims (all but one of which were paid, compared with forty-three remaining unpaid in Queen Margaret's account) and none goes back further than two years.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Rot. Parl.* v. 133, 139, 164-5, 260-2, 300.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 139, 143, 146, 158, 159, 175, 184, 218, 229, 232, 244, 246, 247, 250, 254, 264, 268, 289, 294, 302, 303, 330, 363.

<sup>4</sup> Doubtless her appreciation of the value of money had been enhanced by the experiences of her childhood and adolescence—the impoverishment of her parents and the careful financial management of her guardian and grandmother, Queen Yolande of Aragon.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 146, 150.

her escort was to include five barons and baronesses, thirteen knights, forty-seven esquires (each with his own valet), eighty-two valets, twenty sumptermen, and others.<sup>1</sup> The actual cost, which included not only conventional household expenses, such as food and wages, but items such as the payments of 23s. 4d. to seven trumpeters, and of 65s. 4d. for transporting a lion (given to her at Titchfield, to the Tower of London), exceeded the receipts by nearly £500.<sup>2</sup> To end accounts with a deficit was to be characteristic of Margaret's finances.<sup>3</sup> Nor was this by any means the only considerable expenditure incurred on the strength of inadequate resources for her arrival into England. The sum of £7,000 was, for example, taken from a half-fifteenths granted in the Parliament of 1445 to pay off debts incurred for jewels and clothing for the queen's coronation<sup>4</sup>; and the king's council ordered large sums to be spent on building for the queen's arrival, as, for instance, erecting a new hall with scullery, saucery, and serving place at Eltham Palace, rebuilding the gatehouse at Sheen and walling the garden there with brick, repairing the Great Chamber, the Queen's Lodging, the Parliament Chamber, and the Painted Chamber at Westminster Palace, and constructing a coronation scaffold in Westminster Abbey. Yet we find William Cleve, clerk of the works, who had just supervised the construction of a new kitchen at the Tower of London and a new drawbridge there, petitioning the council because so far he had received no payment, and his workmen had not had their wages.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stevenson, *op. cit.* i. 463-4.

<sup>2</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 23,938, fol. 21a, correctly states the total cost at £5,563 17s. 5d. Stevenson, *op. cit.* i. 460 gives a figure of £5,573 17s. 5d.; but this is £10 too much, as may be seen by adding the "superplusagium" (debt due to the treasurer) of £434 15s. 5d. to the receipts of £5,129 2s. 0d.

<sup>3</sup> As was shown above, her household account for the year 31-32 Henry VI has a small surplus only because it includes nearly £3,000 which should have been included in previous accounts. The five surviving accounts of her treasurers of the chamber and keeper of the jewels reveal considerable deficits (E101/409/14, 17; E101/410/2, 8, 11, for the years 24-25, 25-26, 27-28, 30-31, 31-32 Henry VI, for which the respective deficits were £31 12s. 3d., £931 18s. 7d., £786 9s. 10½d., £234 7s. 0½d., and £540 15s. 4d.). The account for 31-32 Henry VI (E101/409/11) is to be published by the present writer in a later number of the BULLETIN.

<sup>4</sup> Rymer, *op. cit.* v. 1, pp. 141-2.

<sup>5</sup> N. H. Nicolas, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England* (London, 1837), vi. 31-2.

It is therefore not surprising to find in Margaret's household account for the year 31-32 Henry VI that in spite of the financial difficulties of the monarchy, expenditure was on a lavish scale. Some of the items were probably essential such as the wages of the household staff, their expenses while on duty, the cost of materials for drawing up the accounts—pen, ink, parchment, paper, red wax, green cloth, boxes—and so on.<sup>1</sup> But we also find other items which are not routine expenses. Richard Bulstrode was paid £25 9s. 0d. for materials and wages for a "disguising" at the manor of Pleasaunce at Christmas; a Venetian merchant received £73 12s. 6d. for cloth, silk, and gold; Matthew Philip, a goldsmith of London, was owed £125 10s. for jewels and goldsmith's work.<sup>2</sup> These, however, are small items compared with the £566 13s. 4d. provided for the queen's privy purse, the £733 16s. 5d. paid to Edward Ellesmere, treasurer of her chamber and keeper of her jewels, and the £2,073 5s. 8½d. delivered to John Norris, keeper of her great wardrobe.<sup>3</sup> It is true that the queen was spared the large expense which she had two years later, when she gave £3,668 to shore up the tottering finances of her husband's household<sup>4</sup>; but her total household expenditure of £7,539 15s. 4¾d. seems to have been higher than the usual outlay of fourteenth-century queens, and it was much greater than the cost of her successor's household.<sup>5</sup>

The interest of the expenditure section of this account does not end, however, with the light it throws on the scale of the queen's spending. It is of especial value for the unusual information it affords of the organization of the queen's household at this time. The arrangement of the account is not by any means entirely unconventional. The statement of receipts is similar in form to that in the account of John Forster, receiver-general of

<sup>1</sup> Below, fols. 12a-18a.

<sup>2</sup> Below, fols. 18b, 19a.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fols. 20a, 20b, 21a. The expenditure on Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's great wardrobe for 6-7 Edward IV was only £209 13s. 9½d.

<sup>4</sup> E101/410/15. Account of William Fallen, treasurer of the royal household for 33-34 Henry VI. The queen's contribution was not even for a whole year, for the account covered merely the period 3 December, 33 Henry VI—11 May, 34 Henry VI.

<sup>5</sup> *Johnstone I*, pp. 231 ff, esp. pp. 264-84; *Johnstone II*, pp. 253-66. Queen Elizabeth's account is not totalled but the expenses amount to about £4,600 (E36/207, pp. 18-40).



Queen Elizabeth Wydeville for the years 6-7 Edward IV; and both accounts open their statement of expenses with "Feoda militum dominarum et damicellarum infra curiam Regine".<sup>1</sup> This section includes the same officials in both accounts,<sup>2</sup> except that John Forster's account illogically includes the wages of the clerk of the signet at this stage, whereas this official is more rationally grouped with the other clerks in William Cotton's account. But whereas John Forster's account goes straight on to the section "Feoda et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospitium", William Cotton interposes three sections, giving us the names and wages of all the esquires, clerks, yeomen, grooms, and pages of the queen's household, together with the number of days they were in attendance in her court.<sup>3</sup> This is unique among the extant accounts of the queens of this century; it affords a valuable insight into the organization of the queen's household, especially as the amount states, wherever possible, the special occupation of the clerk, yeoman, groom, or page in question.<sup>4</sup> These particulars were compiled, as William Cotton tells us, from the checkrolls in which were entered the names of all those serving the queen in her household and the number of days when they were in attendance on her.<sup>5</sup> The normal method of making a statement of accounts of the royal household for audit in the Exchequer in this century was to give simply the total spent day by day on basic daily wages. If anything else relating to wages was included, it was only a relatively brief statement of the quarterly or half-yearly fees (feoda) and rewards (regarda), which

<sup>1</sup> Below, fol. 12a; E36/207, pp. 18-19.

<sup>2</sup> The amounts paid were the same in each account, except that Barbalina, one of the principal ladies-in-waiting in the household of Queen Margaret, received 40 marks a year, whereas her successor in Queen Elizabeth's household received only 20 marks.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fols. 12b-14a.

<sup>4</sup> It does not appear that we are provided with a complete list of the queen's household staff; the chaplains are conspicuous by their absence. Cf. *Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou* (ed. C. Munro, Cam. Soc. 1863), p. 91, for a letter from Queen Margaret to the Abbess of Shaftesbury in 1447 to obtain the rectory of Corfe Castle for her chaplain, Michael Tregory.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. fol. 12b: vt in rotulis vocatis chekrolles annotati existant vbi omnium armigerorum nomina ac numerus dierum sic serviencium et expectancium singillatim specificantur.

were supplements to the basic wage.<sup>1</sup> This is the only account of this century which reveals the basic rates of pay for the different grades in a royal household. It is additional evidence that the Black Book of the Household of Edward IV was correct in its statement of the rates of wages for the various grades of household officials.<sup>2</sup> The list also shows that the queen was not stinted in the number of her servants, and that she was successful in avoiding much reduction of her household in the following year. In 1454 the King's household was reduced in size as an economy measure during his illness, and Queen Margaret's household was to consist of 120 persons.<sup>3</sup> In this account we see that the total number of her officials and servants within the household was not many more than that in 1452-3, so that the reduction to be made in her staff the following year can have been only slight.<sup>4</sup>

Not only the number of her servants but the payment to them was not meagre. The sections which follow in the account deal with higher officers of the household, their expenses outside the household, and payments to persons outside the household who have rendered some service to it during the year under review. These sections are paralleled by corresponding parts in the household account of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville. The officials and the amounts to be paid to them are often the same in the latter account as in the former ; indeed, John Forster twice refers to an account of Queen Margaret's household as a precedent—probably this very one.<sup>5</sup> But quite a number of expenses which

<sup>1</sup> E.g. E101/409/9, fols. 36a-38a ; E101/409/11, fols. 37b-40a ; E101/409/16, fols. 33b-36b ; E101/410/9, fols. 42b-45a (Accounts of controllers and treasurers of the household for the years 20-21, 22-23, 25-26, 30-31 Henry VI, sections on "Feoda et roba").

<sup>2</sup> *A collection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the royal household* (London, 1790), pp. 36, 38. Cited hereafter as *Household Ordinances*.

<sup>3</sup> Nicolas, *op. cit.* vi. 233. The Black Book of the Household of Edward IV allows the queen's household only 100 servants (*Household Ordinances*, p. 24).

<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to draw a clear line between the queen's servants who are to be reckoned within the household, and those who are to be counted as servants outside ; but it looks from this account as though the number of officials and servants who should properly be included within her household was not more than 130. It is true that, as stated above, no provision seems to have been made for some kinds of household officials, e.g. chaplains ; perhaps such persons were paid by the treasurer of the king's household.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. £10 is to be paid to Queen Elizabeth's chancellor, Roger Radcliff, for his

are set down by the accountant at the same figure as in William Cotton's account (or at a lower figure) are either totally disallowed by the auditors or reduced substantially, usually to half the original amount.<sup>1</sup> These reductions are always said to be by the queen's orders—"mandato domine Regine". Moreover, where in some cases Elizabeth made do with one official, Margaret had had two. Thus whereas John Aleyn seems to have acted both as clerk of the signet and secretary in the household of Queen Elizabeth, and at a fee of only £4 (which was disallowed), George Ashby was clerk of the signet, at a fee of £6 13s. 4d., and Nicholas Carent was her "secretarius".<sup>2</sup> In addition, the highest paid official of Queen Margaret's account, the chief steward of her estates, Viscount Beaumont, at a fee of £66 13s. 4d., does not appear in Queen Elizabeth's account. This fee had been that of the steward of the queen's lands in the fourteenth century<sup>3</sup>; and indeed the spirit behind the fees paid to Margaret's household officials seems in general more akin to the generosity or extravagance of Isabella and Philippa than to the parsimony or thrift of Elizabeth.<sup>4</sup>

In general, however, the organization of Queen Margaret's household was, as one might expect, nearer to that of Elizabeth

household in London, "pro vt Laurentius Bothe, clericus, nuper cancellarius Margarete . . . de eadem habuit et percepit et pro vt huiusmodi allocacio facta fuit eidem Laurencio in compoti Willelmi Cotton, nuper receptoris generalis eiusdem Margarete, de anno XXXI<sup>mo</sup> Henrici" (E36/207, p. 19). (William Cotton's account, printed below, relates to a year, eleven months of which lay within 31 Henry VI). The same authority is given for an allowance of 20s. for wages for Radcliff's journey on business from London to Windsor, for a fee of £10 to John Forster and for an allowance of 45s. to him for a journey from London to Windsor (ibid. pp. 19-21). William Cotton had in turn quoted Queen Catherine's household as a precedent. Below, fol. 14b.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Robert Radcliff's fee of £40 as chancellor (the same as Laurence Bothe's in Queen Margaret's household) is reduced by the auditors to £20; and the fee of £10 for his household, referred to in the previous note, is disallowed entirely. There are twelve more such amendments by the auditors (E36/207, pp. 19-31).

<sup>2</sup> E36/207, p. 19; below, fols. 12b, 17b. "Secretarius" may merely mean "confidential clerk", as it had originally done; Carent does not seem to have been as important as Ashby.

<sup>3</sup> *Johnstone I*, p. 254.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Queen Philippa's general attorney in 1337 received a fee of £6 13s. 4d. for that part of his work relating to the household revenues (*Johnstone II*, p. 287); Robert Tanfield, Queen Margaret's general attorney, was allowed £10 a year (below, fol. 15a); and John Dyve, attorney-general to Queen Elizabeth, was conceded only £5 (E36/207, pp. 21-2).

than to those of the fourteenth century. Both queens had a chancellor—Margaret's being Laurence Bothe, already prebendary of St. Paul's, and soon to be its Dean. In this he resembled the chancellor of Queen Elizabeth in the year 6-7 Edward IV, Robert Radcliff, who was also, at the time of the year under review, a prebendary of St. Paul's, of which he also later became dean.<sup>1</sup> The subsequent careers of the two men were, however, very different, probably in large measure because of the contrasts in the characters and opportunities of the queens they served. Robert Radcliff died in 1471 still Dean of St. Paul's.<sup>2</sup> The dominating personality of Queen Margaret, always quick and determined to help those in whom she trusted, did much better for her chancellor. He probably owed his position in the first place to the confidence reposed by the queen in his brother, and predecessor as her chancellor, William Bothe, created in 1447 Bishop of Lichfield, whom her influence had helped in 1451 to secure promotion to the archbishopric of York.<sup>3</sup> It may have been her backing which advanced Laurence to the office of keeper of the privy seal in 1456<sup>4</sup>; it was certainly her support which led to his appointment in January 1457 as one of the tutors to the Prince of Wales, and in September of the same year as Bishop of Durham. Indeed, the latter appointment was a striking testimony to her forcefulness; for Henry VI had already nominated his physician, John Arundell, to the vacant see, and the more energetic recommendation of Queen Margaret was one of the factors which led Pope Calixtus III to provide Laurence Bothe to the bishopric instead.<sup>5</sup> While he was chancellor to

<sup>1</sup> J. Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (rev. T. D. Hardy) (Oxford, 1854), ii. 421, 313, 383, 313.

<sup>2</sup> Whereas he held only one prebend from 1458 until his appointment as dean ten years later, Laurence Bothe was given two more prebends in 1453, both on the same day, 21 November (ibid. pp. 407, 449), five years after his appointment to the first prebend in 1449 and less than two months after the close of this household account. Two years later, on 22 November 1456, he was elected Dean.

<sup>3</sup> Rymer, op. cit. v. 1, pp. 171-2; v. 2, p. 43; William Bothe had also been a prebendary of St. Paul's; he was appointed in 1443 (Le Neve, op. cit. ii. 375).

<sup>4</sup> *The Paston Letters* (ed. J. Gairdner, London, 1910), i. 408.

<sup>5</sup> Rymer, op. cit., v. 2, pp. 77-8. After reciting how the king had formerly written on behalf of Laurence Bothe, the papal bull continues: "In cujus etiam singularem & praecipuam commendationem novissime accepimus Litteras,



Queen Margaret, his post seems to have been no sinecure. The account shows how at every stage almost all payments of importance were authorized by warrants or letters patent under the queen's great seal ; and the scale of activity of the queen's household must have kept the chancellor and his subordinates busy.

Both chancellors had a clerk of the registers to help them, but Elizabeth was not prepared to pay to her clerk the £5 fee which Margaret allowed to hers.<sup>1</sup> All these warrants and the receipts for payments were stored away ready for the compilation of the account, as is carefully stated in each case. The chancellor's clerk was not the only one writing documents for the queen, however. There was a clerk of the receipt, who deputized for the receiver-general in his absence, and wrote a roll of the knights' fees, indentures, acquittances, obligations, and other memoranda relating to the office of the receiver-general. Margaret's clerk of the receipt, William Nanseglos (who was also receiver of the queen's revenues from Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and London) was also paid a fee of £5 which was denied to the corresponding official in Queen Elizabeth's household.<sup>2</sup> The clerk of the jewels kept records of the queen's purchases and gifts, and of her personal expenditure, under the direction of the treasurer of her chamber and keeper of her jewels.<sup>3</sup> The clerk of the signet presumably wrote the documents which were sealed with her signet seal ; in the nature of the case this account does not include any mention of such documents, for once money had been paid into the queen's chamber and the treasurer of the household had been given receipts for it under her great seal,<sup>4</sup> his responsibility was at an end. The queen's secretary had a particular responsibility for the acts of the council<sup>5</sup>; and, finally,

*carissimae in Christo Filiae nostrae, Margaretae Reginae Angliae Illustris Consortis tuae, & aliorum plurimorum Dominorum ac Nobilium tui Regni, quibus facile judicare potuimus quam Utilis, Accommoda, & Laudabilis foret Provisio de Persona ipsius Laurentii ad eandem Dunelmensem Ecclesiam."*

<sup>1</sup> Below, fol. 16a ; E36/207, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Below, fols. 1b, 16a ; E36/207, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fols. 12b, 20a and b. Edward Ellesmere, Queen Margaret's treasurer of the chamber, was also receiver of her revenues from Marlborough and Devizes (below, fol. 2a). The queen also employed a clerk of the closet, who may also have worked under the treasurer of the chamber (fol. 12b).

<sup>4</sup> Below, fols. 12b, 21a.

<sup>5</sup> Below, fol. 17b.

the clerk of the auditors had the task of engrossing the accounts of various receivers, bailiffs, and feodaries, as well as compiling the treasurer's account.<sup>1</sup> Some idea of the relative amount of writing done by three of these clerks may be gained from the amount of writing materials bought for them during the year of the account. The parchment, paper, red wax, and ink bought and expended by the queen's chancery cost 60s., the materials for the receiver-general's office cost 46s. 8d., and the secretary of the council was supplied with writing materials to the value of 40s.<sup>2</sup>

The clerical and financial officials were not the only important members of the staff of the queen's household. There was the chamberlain, Sir John Wenlock,<sup>3</sup> whose financial activities did not leave much mark on the treasurer's account; his chief financial function was presumably to authorize payments from the queen's privy purse, which did not concern the treasurer of the household.<sup>4</sup> It is significant, in this age of litigation, that a much more prominent place in the accounts is occupied by the law-officers of the queen. Chief among them was Robert Tanfield. As her attorney-general he had the task of prosecuting and defending all kinds of pleas and actions for or against the queen in all the king's courts; but his usual work seems to have been in the exchequer, where most of the queen's legal business would naturally lie.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, he had two assistant attorneys to help him in the Exchequer, so great was the pressure of business there. The queen had also three other attorneys, John Vailard, Thomas Lloyd, and Simon Elleryngton, who looked after her interests in the royal chancery and the courts of king's bench

<sup>1</sup> Below, fol. 18a. Margaret's clerk of the auditors slipped in the statement that this was a "great labour" and was paid 40s. for his pains. Elizabeth's account was compiled by her clerk of the receipts; he was less fortunate, for his fee of £5 was disallowed by the auditors (E36/207, p. 24).

<sup>2</sup> Below, fol. 17b.

<sup>3</sup> He had been usher of the queen's chamber since at least January 1447, and chamberlain since at least January 1450 (*C.P.R. 1446-1452*, pp. 28, 311).

<sup>4</sup> See below, fol. 21a, for five large payments, totalling £566 13s. 4d., into the queen's chamber.

<sup>5</sup> Below, fol. 15a; cf. E36/207, p. 22, for a similar description of the duties of John Dyve, attorney-general to Queen Elizabeth. John Dyve does not appear to have had the two assistant attorneys in the Exchequer enjoyed by Robert Tanfield (below, fol. 16a).

and common pleas.<sup>1</sup> Besides this, five apprentices-at-law were retained at a fee of 26s. 8d. each per annum to be of the queen's council.<sup>2</sup>

The queen's council played an important role in administering the large share of the Duchy of Lancaster estates which had been assigned as her dowry, and the household which those estates substantially helped to support. It met every day,<sup>3</sup> and the queen had a council chamber assigned to her in the palace of Westminster.<sup>4</sup> To this council chamber some of the members of the council travelled at times from a distance,<sup>5</sup> and it was doubtless of this council chamber that William Randolf was the usher.<sup>6</sup> The council had an envoy, Roger Morecroft, who was also usher and keeper of the "new tower" at Westminster which the king had assigned to the queen not only for the meetings of her council but also for the safe custody of her books and evidences.<sup>7</sup> The council included not only officials of the household but persons from outside—some of them very important, as, for instance, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset.<sup>8</sup> Some of its members were not only household officials but collectors of her revenues, thus linking the central and local administration of her affairs.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Below, fol. 16a. Queen Elizabeth's account names attorneys in the courts of Common Pleas (Thomas Thoralde) and King's Bench (Thomas Luyt), but not in the Chancery. On the other hand it names a solicitor-general, Robert Iseham (E36/207, pp. 23, 25).

<sup>2</sup> Below, fol. 16a. Queen Elizabeth paid only two apprentices-at-law (Henry Suthill and Thomas Urswick), but she also paid two serjeants-at-law (Thomas Young and John Catesby,) (E36/207, pp. 25, 26).

<sup>3</sup> Below, fol. 19b. Thomas, Lord Scales, was paid "pro diurna diligencia et attendencia in consilio eiusdem Regine".

<sup>4</sup> Below, fol. 16b; *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, pp. 114, 487.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. William Cotton from Suffolk to London.

<sup>6</sup> Below, fol. 16a; cf. E36/207, p. 26, where John Wode is also called "hostiarius domus magni consilii" and seven other ushers are paid, as in Queen Margaret's household, "pro eorum attendencia consilio prefate Regine in officiis suis".

<sup>7</sup> Below, fol. 16b; cf. E36/207, p. 26, for the payment of David Gogh for the same duties, where the precedent of "Roger Morescroft", messenger for the council and keeper of the new tower, "tempore Margarete, nuper de facto set non de jure Regine Anglie", is adduced.

<sup>8</sup> Below, fol. 17a.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. William Nanseglos, collector of the queen's revenues in Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and London, who was also clerk of the Queen's receipt (below, fols. 1b, 16a), and Edward Ellesmere, collector of the queen's revenues from Marlborough and Devizes, who was also treasurer of the chamber (below, fols. 2a, 20a).

The principal members of Queen Margaret's council at the time of this account seem to have included Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, Sir John Wenlock, her chamberlain, Laurence Bothe, her chancellor, William Cotton, her receiver-general and treasurer of her household, Edward Hall and Andrew Agard, her knight carvers, Edward Ellesmere, the treasurer of her chamber, Robert Tanfield, her attorney-general, and ten other attorneys and apprentices-at-law.<sup>1</sup>

It is easier to note members of Queen Margaret's council in her account than to discern clear evidence of its functions. A century earlier the queen's council had had judicial, administrative, and advisory functions<sup>2</sup>; and it may well have continued to exercise these as actively in the fifteenth century. It seems to be suggested by the daily meetings of the council, and the recorded journeyings of members of the queen's council about the country engaged on her business.<sup>3</sup> Queen Margaret's council could make appointments and perform executive actions<sup>4</sup>; but there are few references in this account to such exercises of authority. In theory the queen was the mainspring of the household organization, as she had been in the days of Queen Isabella and Queen Philippa<sup>5</sup>; and all the instructions to the household officials were issued in her name alone. Doubtless with a queen so vigorous and determined as Queen Margaret the theory was also the reality; and the council, though active, may well have been strictly subordinate to the wishes and commands of the queen. Not that Queen Margaret failed to appreciate the labours of her councillors and officials on her behalf. On the contrary, her ardent nature impelled her to push their interests as energetically as possible. We have already observed an instance

<sup>1</sup> Below, fols. 14b-15a, fols. 20a-20b, fol. 12a, fol. 15b, fol. 16a. Viscount Beaumont was the steward of the queen's lands, not, apparently, of her household, and received the same fee as Philippa's steward of the queen's lands had done (*Johnstone II*, p. 254). It is interesting that neither Margaret's nor Elizabeth's account mention the steward, controller, or cofferer of the household, who had been so prominent in the fourteenth century households (*Johnstone I*, pp. 236-57).

<sup>2</sup> *Johnstone II*, p. 292.

<sup>3</sup> Below, fols. 14b-16b; E36/207, pp. 21, 22.

<sup>4</sup> Below, fols. 16a, 16b. Roger Morecroft was sent to various parts of England "per mandatum dicte Regine et consilij sui".

<sup>5</sup> *Johnstone II*, p. 291.



of this in the case of Laurence Bothe, her chancellor, and other examples may be found in her letters. Some of them were written on behalf of officials of her household mentioned in this account,<sup>1</sup> and almost all were addressed to influential persons on behalf of protégés of hers. And, as her most recent biographer has pointed out, when her influence was dominant in the government in 1457 and 1458 "she used her period of influence and power to secure promotion for those whom she favoured".<sup>2</sup> This eager and incautious support met with varying response from the officials of her household. William Cotton, her treasurer and receiver-general, died fighting on the Lancastrian side at the first battle of St. Albans in 1455<sup>3</sup> and Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, perished in the Lancastrian cause at the battle of Northampton in 1460.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, Laurence Bothe made his peace with Edward IV, and found sufficient favour with him to be elevated in 1476 to the archbishopric of York<sup>5</sup>; and Sir John Wenlock, her chamberlain, deserted to the Yorkist side as early as 1455.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou*, p. 94 (for Nicholas Carent, Dean of Wells, her secretary); p. 97 (for Thomas Burneby, sewer for the mouth); pp. 107, 108 (for Thomas Sharnborne, a squire of her household); p. 114 (for George Asheby, clerk of her signet); p. 115 (for Margaret Stanlowe, one of her gentlewomen); p. 119 (for Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, and Edmund Clere, a squire of her household); p. 133 (for Thomas Hery, a groom of her chamber); p. 151 (for Thomas Mowsherst, a yeoman of her household); cf. below, fols. 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 17b. On p. 112 of the *Letters* is a message of 1447-8 from the queen to the customers of Southampton, exhorting them to pay the overdue instalment of her dowry from that port.

<sup>2</sup> J. J. Bagley, *Margaret of Anjou, Queen of England* (London, 1948), p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> *Paston Letters*, i. 333.

<sup>4</sup> *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461* (Camden Society, 1856, ed. J. S. Davies), p. 97.

<sup>5</sup> Rymer, op. cit. v. 3, p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> At the first battle of St. Albans (22 May 1455) he was wounded while fighting on the Lancastrian side (*The Paston Letters*, i. 331); but in July of the same year he was elected speaker of the commons in the Yorkist Parliament summoned after the battle (*Rot. Parl.* v. 278), and by 1458 he was sufficiently in the confidence of the Duke of York to be sent to treat for the marriage of one of the duke's sons to the grand-daughter of the Duke of Burgundy, and, failing that, to one of the French princesses (Stevenson, op. cit. i. 361-77). In 1460 we find Wenlock's cook, John Byschoppe, leading the attack on the carts of victuals sent to Queen Margaret and her army by the lord mayor of London after the 2nd battle of St. Albans (*Gregory's Chronicle*, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, 1876, p. 214). In view of his subsequent desertion to the Lancastrian side, with Warwick, in 1470,

The effects of the queen's dominating personality are also to be seen in some of the largest payments recorded in this account. One of them, it is true, was fixed by custom—the payment for the expenses of the queen and her servants at the rate of £7 a day when she was residing in the king's household.<sup>1</sup> This accounted for £967 7s. 3d. paid to Lord Stourton, formerly treasurer of the king's household, during the years 28-31 Henry VI, and for £797 8s. 11½d. paid to Lord Dudley, his successor for the years 31-32 Henry VI.<sup>2</sup> But even in this case the expenditure appears to have exceeded that of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville, in whose account there was no corresponding allocation, though she must have dwelt in her husband's household for part of the year; and in all the other large items Queen Margaret's expenditure was on a grander scale than that of her successor. Margaret's clerk avener, who looked after her stables, was allowed £418 19s. 3½d. to maintain them for the year; Elizabeth's clerk avener received only £208 6s. 8d. for the same purpose.<sup>3</sup> To her great wardrobe, which supplied articles of clothing and stocks of dress materials, Queen Margaret assigned £2,073 5s. 8¼d.; her successor allocated only £1,200 3s. 0¾d. for the purchase of such items.<sup>4</sup> At first sight it may appear as though Queen Margaret's personal resources for exercising her influence were smaller than those of Queen Elizabeth. The latter took for her privy purse £918 18s. 0¼d. for the year 6-7 Edward IV compared with only £566 13s. 4d. recorded as paid into her predecessor's chamber during the year of the account.<sup>5</sup> But Queen Elizabeth's account makes no mention of an allocation to the treasurer of the chamber and keeper of the jewels; whereas Edward Ellesmere, the holder of this position in 1452-3, received in all for his office £800 9s. 9d.<sup>6</sup>

the story of his end as told by Edward Hall seems credible, that at the battle of Tewkesbury the Duke of Somerset suspected Wenlock of changing sides yet again and "with his axe he strake the braynes out of his hedde" (Hall's *Chronicle* (ed. Ellis, 1809), p. 300).

<sup>1</sup> See the statement of the Black Book of the Household of Edward IV on this matter (*Household Ordinances*, p. 24).

<sup>2</sup> Below, fol. 20b. In the fourteenth century "it was common for the queen's wardrobe to make grants to the king's" (*Johnstone I*, p. 283).

<sup>3</sup> Below, fols. 19a, 20a; E36/207, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Below, fol. 20a; E36/207, pp. 37, 38.

<sup>5</sup> E36/207, p. 40; below, fol. 20b.

<sup>6</sup> Below, fols. 20a, 20b.

Thus Queen Margaret received for all aspects of her chamber expenditure £1,719 7s. 9¼d., an unusually impressive sum with which to make her influence felt. With its aid she could reward her friends by gifts of cash, presents of jewels and other favours, and overawe her foes by the extent of her power.<sup>1</sup> In the struggles which were soon to usher in the Wars of the Roses the queen increasingly took the lead in organizing the forces of the house of Lancaster; and in this task she would need every penny she could gain from her household resources.<sup>2</sup> In following her indomitable efforts in that struggle we are helped by the light shed by this account on the extent of those resources, the way in which they were used, and the organization and personnel of her household which carried out her purposes.

THE ACCOUNT BOOK OF WILLIAM COTTON, ESQUIRE,  
RECEIVER-GENERAL OF QUEEN MARGARET OF ANJOU,  
FOR THE YEAR 31-32 HENRY VI<sup>3</sup>

fol. 1a

Compotus Willelmi Cotton,<sup>4</sup> armigeri, generalis receptoris Margarete Regine Anglie et Francie filie Regis Sicilis et Jerusalem', omnium castrorum, honorum, annuitatum, reddituum, reuencuum, terrarum, et tenementorum suorum ac aliarum commoditatum quaruncumque eidem pertinentium, videlicet, tam de

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the five surviving accounts of her treasurers of the chamber for the years 24-25, 25-26, 27-28, 30-31, 31-32 Henry VI (E101/409/14, 17; E101/410/2, 8, 11), which show long lists of gifts of jewels and other presents to servants, friends, and allies. Cf. *Paston Letters*, i. 378: "The Quene is a grete and stronge labourid woman, for she spareth noo payne to sue hire thinges to an intent and conclusion to hir power" (John Bocking to Sir John Fastolf, 9 February 1456).

<sup>2</sup> Davies's *Chronicle*, p. 79, says of her in the year 1459-60: "The queen with such as were of her affynyte rewled the reame as her lyked, gaderyng ryches innumerable"; but all the indications are that the struggle against her foes was a heavy drain on her resources instead of augmenting them. The same source goes on to tell, in the same paragraph, how in order to gain support in Cheshire she kept "open household" there and caused her son the prince to give a livery of swans to all the gentlemen of the countryside.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O. MS. Duchy of Lancaster 28/5/8.

<sup>4</sup> For an annotated biography of William Cotton see Somerville, *op. cit.* p. 399. In addition to the information given there it may be mentioned that the patent roll tells us he had surrendered the office of keeper of the great wardrobe by 14 June 1453 (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 77).

huiusmodi receptoris per ipsum causa officij sui receptis quam de solucionibus, misis, custubus, et expensis a festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxjmo Regis Henrici sexti vsque idem festum extunc proxime sequentem anno eiusdem Regis xxxijdo, scilicet per vnum annum integrum.

*Arreragia*—Nullum, quia in superplusagio super terminacione vltimi compoti sui anni proxime precedentis—Nullum.

*Recepta denariorum de receptore de Tuttebury*<sup>1</sup>

Et de denariis receptis de Roberto Whitgreue,<sup>2</sup> armigero, nuper receptore ibidem, tam de arreragiis suis anni precedentis quam de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, prima vice xvo die Maij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> de exitibus xxxij.li.vj.s.vij.d., secunda vice xxj die Julij eodem anno per manus Johannis Norrys de arreragiis suis vij.li.vij.s.ij.d.ob.q., et tercia vice per manus administratoris bonorum et catallorum dicti Roberti ad manus Johannis Hattecliff primo die Marcij supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xx.li., per iij indenturas restitutas

lx.li.xij.s.x.d.ob.q.

Et de denariis receptis de Roberto Hill<sup>3</sup> receptore ibidem de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, prima xv<sup>o</sup> die Decembris dicto anno xxxij.<sup>do</sup> cc.li., secunda vice xj<sup>mo</sup> die Februarij eodem anno cx.li.ix.s.ij.d., et tercia vice xvj<sup>o</sup> die eiusdem mensis cum iijj.li. per manus Radulphi Pole xx.li., per iij indenturas vt supra restitutas—cccxxx.li.ix.s.ij.d.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus Walteri Blounte,<sup>4</sup> balliui Alti Pecci,<sup>5</sup> xxijj<sup>cl</sup>o die Nouembris dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xl.li., et altera vice xxix<sup>no</sup> die Marcij eodem anno xxxix.li.xij.s.iiij.d., per ij indenturas

lxxix.li.xij.s.iiij.d.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus dicti Walteri, balliui Alti Pecci, xij<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis supradicto xxxij<sup>do</sup>, per indenturas inde restitutas xx.li.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus Thome Whitgreue, clericij, et Humfridi Whitgreue,<sup>6</sup> executorum testamenti predicti Roberti Whitgreue

<sup>1</sup> Tutbury and High Peak were both parts of the honour of Tutbury, from which revenues to the annual value of £927 17s. 4½d. were assigned to the queen in 1446 (*Rot Parl.* v. 118). It will be noted that for the year covered by this account she had received only £526 9s. 8½d., and then only by including items paid in well after the end of the financial year.

<sup>2</sup> For Robert Whitgreue's career see Somerville, *op. cit.* p. 543; also J. Wedgwood, *History of Parliament, Biographies of Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509* (H.M.S.O., 1936), p. 941. He attended the coronation of Queen Margaret (*Exchequer Accounts*, 361/6). He died in 1452 (not in 1449, an alternative suggested by Somerville), and this explains why the first two payments were made by him and the third was made by the administrators of his goods and chattels.

<sup>3</sup> See Somerville, *op. cit.* p. 540 and Wedgwood, *op. cit.* p. 455.

<sup>4</sup> Walter Blount later became Lord Mountjoy (1465). Cf. Somerville, *op. cit.* pp. 551, 553.

<sup>5</sup> See note 1 above.

<sup>6</sup> Humphrey Whitgreue was the son of Robert Whitgreue. See Somerville, *op. cit.* p. 550, Wedgwood, *op. cit.* p. 941, and *C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 326. It is not known what kinship Thomas Whitgreue was to Robert.



nuper receptoris ibidem, v<sup>to</sup> die Julij dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, per indenturam

xx.li.xix.s.

Et eidem receptori de huiusmodi recepta sua per manus dicti Roberti Hille, receptoris ibidem, ad manus auditoris super vadiis suis—vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et eidem receptori per manus eiusdem Roberti, de huiusmodi recepta sua, iiij<sup>to</sup> die Junij dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, per indenturam—viiij.li.

Summa pagine—Dxxvj.li.ix.s.viiij.d.ob.q.

fol. 1b

*Leycestr*<sup>1</sup>

Et de Thoma Staunton,<sup>2</sup> armigero, receptori ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad vij vices, videlicet, prima vice nono die Maij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> xxxvij.li., secunda vice xix<sup>no</sup> die Septembris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xxiiij.li., tertia vice xxj<sup>mo</sup> die Nouembris eodem anno xx.li., iiij<sup>ta</sup> vice xxij<sup>do</sup> die eiusdem mensis xx.li., quinta vice xxij<sup>o</sup> die eiusdem mensis per manus Johannis vicecomitis Beaumont xxxiiij.li.vjs.viiij.d., sexta vice xxvij<sup>o</sup> die Januarij dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> l.li., et vija vice xj<sup>mo</sup> die Februarij eodem anno per manus Johannis Stanford cx.s.ij.d.ob., per vij indenturas inde restitutas

xx  
ciiijix.li.xvj.s.x.d.ob.

Summa—<sup>xx</sup>  
ciiijix.li.xvj.s.x.d.ob.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta de Kenelworth*<sup>3</sup>

Et de Johanne Beaunfitz,<sup>4</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad ij vices, videlicet, vna vice tercio die Maij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> vj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d., et altera vice xix<sup>mo</sup> die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xij.li.xj.s.viiij.d., per ij indenturas inde restitutas—xix.li.v.s.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus Johannis Walssh auditoris super feoda et vadia sua sine indentura—x.li

Summa—xxix.li.v.s.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta de Berkhamstede*<sup>5</sup>

Et de Johanne Thirlowe, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni. per manus Johannis Stanford ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice xj<sup>mo</sup> die

<sup>1</sup> Revenues to the annual value of £250 7s. 11½d. were assigned in 1446 to the queen from the honour of Leicester (*Rot. Parl.* v. 118a). She managed to draw only just over £180 of this for the year of this account.

<sup>2</sup> See Somerville, op. cit. p. 566, also Wedgwood, op. cit. p. 803. Usher of the chamber, 1439-60.

<sup>3</sup> The annual value of the castle and lordship of Kenilworth assigned to the queen in 1446 was said to be £15 4s. 6½d. (*Rot. Parl.* v. 119a); so she may have received some arrears this year.

<sup>4</sup> See Somerville, op. cit. p. 562.

<sup>5</sup> The revenues from Berkhamstead should have amounted to 40 marks (£26 13s. 4d.) a year (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 340). The honour and manor of B. were in 1495 assigned in jointure to Elizabeth, Queen of Henry VII (*Rot. Parl.* vi. 462b).

Februarij anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> vj.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., secunda vice xxvij die Junij eodem anno vij.li.xj.s.viiij.d., tercia vice ad manus Johannis Walssh auditoris super feoda et vadiis suis vj.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., et iiij<sup>ta</sup> vice dicto xxvij die eiusdem mensis viij.s.vj.d., per vnam indenturam restitutam———xxj.li.vj.s.x.d.

Summa———xxj.li.vj.s.x.d.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta comitatus Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, et Londonie*<sup>1</sup>

Et de Willelmo Nanseglos,<sup>2</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad xj vices, videlicet, prima vice vltimo die Maij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> <sup>xx</sup>iiij xij.li., secunda vice iiij<sup>to</sup> die Junij eodem anno xxij.li.x.s., tercia vice xij die Octobris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xx.li., iiij<sup>ta</sup> vice xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die eiusdem mensis x.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., v<sup>ta</sup> vice nono die Nouembris eodem anno lxxix.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., vj<sup>ta</sup> vice iiij<sup>to</sup> die Decembris anno predicto xxxix.li.v.s.x.d., vij<sup>a</sup> vice xij<sup>o</sup> die Januarij eodem anno xlj.li.x.s., viij<sup>a</sup> vice xx<sup>mo</sup> die Octobris anno supradicto per manus Petri Preston' iiij.li.xvij.s.vj.d., ix<sup>na</sup> vice xx<sup>o</sup> die eiusdem mensis per manus firmarij terre domanij de Walden cvj.s.viiij.d., x<sup>ma</sup> vice xx<sup>mo</sup> die Februarij anno predicto iiij.li.xv.s.q.d., et xj<sup>ma</sup> vice secundo die Aprilis dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xxxiiij.li.xxij.d. per v indenturas inde restitutas———cccliij.li.xiij.s.vq.d.

Summa———cccliij.li.xiij.s.v.d.q.d.

Summa pagine———<sup>xx</sup>Diiij xiiij.li.ij.s.j.d.ob.q.d.

fol. 2a

*Recepta denariorum de recepta in partibus australibus*<sup>3</sup>

Et de Willelmo Osgodby,<sup>4</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad v vices, videlicet, prima vice vij<sup>o</sup> die Junij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> xl.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., secunda vice primo die Augusti eodem anno xxij.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., tercia vice xx<sup>mo</sup> die Octobris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> vij.li.ix.s.viiij.d.ob., iiij<sup>ta</sup> vice x<sup>mo</sup> die Nouembris eodem anno l.x.li., et quinta vice xxvij<sup>o</sup> die Januarij eodem anno xliiij.li., per v indenturas———clxxiiij.li.xvj.s.iiij.d.ob.

Summa———clxxiiij.li.xvj.s.iiij.d.ob.

*Recepta denariorum de Marleburgh et Devyses*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These are the revenues of the honours of Tutbury, Lancaster and Leicester in the shires of Essex, Hertford, Middlesex, and London, assigned to the queen in 1446 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 118b). Their annual value is not stated separately.

<sup>2</sup> See Somerville, op. cit. p. 608.

<sup>3</sup> The term "south parts" denoted an administrative unit of the Duchy of Lancaster and comprised its estates in the shires of Southampton, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Berkshire, Oxford, Hereford, and Worcester. (Somerville, op. cit. p. 99, 104 n. 1, 113 n. 4).

<sup>4</sup> See Somerville, op. cit. p. 622.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *C.P.R. 1446-1452*, p. 559, where a grant of the revenues of Marlborough and Devyses and other lands, originally made to her by letters patent dated 24 February 1447, is now (28 February 1452) confirmed to her for life. M. and D. were granted to Queen Elizabeth Wydeville in 1467 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 627b).

Et de Edwardo Ellesmere,<sup>1</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni xj<sup>mo</sup> die Marcij anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> dicti Regis Henrici Sexti, per indenturam inde restitutam—<sup>xx</sup> ciiij.li.

Summa—<sup>xx</sup> ciiij.li.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta de Middelton' et Merden'*

Et de Johanne Thornebury,<sup>2</sup> armigero, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni per manus Edwardi Ellesmere ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice penultimo die Januarij supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xl.li., et altera vice tercio die Marcij eodem anno xl.li., per ij indenturas inde restitutas—<sup>xx</sup> iiij.li.

Summa—<sup>xx</sup> iiij.li.

*Recepta denariorum de feodo nomine Comitis Essex*<sup>3</sup>

Et de Johanne Pygote, vicecomite comitatus Essex, anno xxv<sup>to</sup> dicti regis Henrici sexti de parte xl.li.x.s.x.d. per annum de feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus Ducatui Regis Lancastrie pertinente annuatim, percipiendo per manus vicecomitis eiusdem comitatus pro tempore existentis ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter et dicte Margarete Regine in dotem concessa, videlicet, in partem solucionis feodi predicti pro dicto anno xxv per indenturam inde penes dictum Johannem remanentem—x.li.x.s.x.d.

De xxx.li. residuentibus dicti xl.li.x.s.x.d. de feodo nomine comitis comitatus predicti dicte Regine anno xxv<sup>to</sup> debitis non reddit, eo quod restant in manus dicti Johannis Pygote vicecomitis ibidem eodem anno nondum solute vnde idem vicecomes debet Regine respondere. Et recepit—Nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.li.x.s.x.d. de consimili feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus domino Regi ducatus sue predictae pertinente annuatim, percipiendis vt supra ad terminos predictos equaliter et eidem Regine vt pro anno xxvij<sup>o</sup> dicti Regis Henrici Sexti debitis, eo quod remanent in manus Georgij Langham vicecomitis predicti eodem anno xxvij<sup>o</sup> nondum soluti, vnde idem vicecomes debet Regine respondere. Et recepit—Nihil.

Set reddit de denariis receptis de Johanne Godmerston, vicecomite comitatus predicti, supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> de feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus xl.li.x.s.x.d. per annum percipiendis ad terminos supradictos equaliter, videlicet, in persolucione feodi predicti pro eodem anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> per indenturam inde penes dictum Johannem remanentem—xl.li.x.s.x.d.

Summa—li.li.xx.d.

Summa pagine—<sup>xx</sup> cccciijv.li.xvij.s.ob.

<sup>1</sup> See Somerville, op. cit. p. 550.

<sup>2</sup> See Wedgwood, op. cit. pp. 847-8.

<sup>3</sup> The Fee of the Shire of Essex, granted in 1446, should have been worth £40 10s. 10d. a year (*Rot. Parl.* v. 119a).

*Recepta denariorum de thesaurarij domanij et comitatus Pembroke*<sup>1</sup>

De aliquibus denariorum summis per ipsum recepturis de arreragiis aliquorum balliuorum aut ministrorum diuersorum et maneriorum ibidem hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos [sic] huiusmodi denarios ad manus dicti receptoris generalis Regine minime liberati fuerunt vt dicit super sacramentum suum  
nihil.

Nec reddit de aliquibus exitibus comitatus castri et domanij de Pembrok' cum membris et pertinentibus suis in comitatu Hereford ac marchia Wallie eidem comitatui adiacente aut castri ville et domanij de Kilgarran cum membris et pertinentibus suis necnon castri ville siue domanij de Llanstephan cum membris et pertinentibus suis in comitatu et marchia predictis valoris cccc.li.ij.s.viii.d. per annum supradicte Margarete Regine nuper concessis in partem recompensacionis et deduccionis cuiusdam summe MMMDCIxxv.li.xiiij.s.iiiij.d. eidem Regine concesse et assignate in partem dotis ad terminum vite sue, videlicet, de exitibus aut proficuis eorundem diuersorum maneriorum terrarum aut tenementorum a supradicto festo sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> seu postea, eo quod idem rex ex assensu prefate Regine ac de auisamento et assensu dominorum spiritualium et temporalium ac communitatis regni sui Anglie in parlamento suo apud Redyng anno regni sui xxxj<sup>mo</sup> inchoato et tento existente auctoritate eiusdem parlamenti dedit et concessit Jaspero de Hatfeld, Comiti Pembroch' fratro suo, comitatum, castra, domania, et villas predicta cum membris et pertinentibus suis, habenda a festo sancti Michelis dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> eidem Comiti et heredibus masculis de corpore sue exeuntibus et ad effectum quod rex recompensacioni prefati consorti sue pro dictis comitatu castris domanijs ac ceteris premissis concedere dignaretur  
nihil.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta domanij de Hauerford West*<sup>2</sup>

Set reddit de denariis receptis de Thoma Parker,<sup>3</sup> armigero, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni xxviiij<sup>o</sup> die Julij supradicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> per manus Mathei Phelipp', per indenturam———cxxv.li.x.s.vij.d.

Summa———cxxv.li.x.s.vij.d.

<sup>1</sup> In 1451 the revenues of the shire, castle, lordship, and towns of Pembroke (including those of Kilgarran and Llanstephan), amounting in all to £400 2s. 8d. a year, were granted to the queen as part of her dowry. In 1453 they were transferred to Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke; and not only was the queen fully compensated by other grants but it was provided that all arrears from Pembroke due down to the transfer of the lands to Jasper should be paid to the queen (*Rot. Parl.* v. 261a-262b).

<sup>2</sup> The lordship, castle, manor and town of Haverford West was estimated to be worth £121 2s. 9d. a year (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 340).

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Parker was an usher of the king's chamber and king's esquire in June 1453, i.e. during the year of this account (*C.P.R. 1452-1461*, p. 77).



*Recepta denariorum de recepta de Rokyngham*<sup>1</sup> et aliorum maneriorum in comitatu Northampton

Et de denariis receptis Johanne Hattecliff, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice xv<sup>o</sup> die Septembris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xiiij.li.vj.s.viii.d., et alia vice vltimo die Februarij eodem anno cxl.li., per ij indenturas———clij.li.vj.s.viii.d.

Summa———clij.li.vj.s.viii.d.

*Recepta denariorum de recepta de Odyam' et Guillyngham*<sup>2</sup>

Et de Edwardo Ellesmere,<sup>3</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice de exitibus domanij de Guillyngham xlvj.li., et altera vice de exitibus domanij de Odiam xx.li. sine indentura  
lxvj.li.

Summa———lxvj.li.

Summa pagine———cccxliiij.li.xvij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 3a

*Haueryng atte Bowere Bradwell' Kiddeswell' Hadley et Colcestr'*<sup>4</sup>

Et de Willelmo Nanseglos,<sup>5</sup> receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, vna vice xx<sup>mo</sup> die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> xxxiiij.li.xiiij.s.ix.d.ob., secunda vice xxvj<sup>to</sup> die eiusdem mensis xxxvj.li.xj.s.ij.d., et tercia vice per manus balliui de Kiddeswell ad manus Nicolai Shapp' auditoris vij.li.x.s., vt patet per compotum suum de hoc anno———lxxviiij.li.xiiij.s.xj.d.ob.

Summa———lxxviiij.li.xiiij.s.xj.d.ob.

*Manerium de Plesaunce in Grenewiche*<sup>6</sup>

De aliquibus denariorum summis per ipsum recepturis de Roberto Cheseman collectore reddituum et firmarum ibidem de exitibus officij sui huius anni non reddit, eo quod aliquos huiusmodi denarios per tempus predictum minime recepit, nec idem Robertus ad compotum suum pro eodem officio reddendum hoc anno comparuit———nihil.

<sup>1</sup> The castle, manor, lordship and forest of Rockingham formed part of the estates granted to Margaret in 1453 as compensation for the loss of Pembroke (*Rot. Parl.* v. 261b). See p. 104 note 1. In 1467 it was granted to Elizabeth Wydeville (*ibid.* p. 627a).

<sup>2</sup> The castle, lordship, manor, and hundred of Odiham (Hants.) and the manor, town, barton, and forest of Gillingham (Dorset) were also granted as compensation for the loss of Pembroke.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 103 note 1.

<sup>4</sup> The revenues from these sources should have totalled £156 a year (*C.P.R.* 1452-1461, p. 340).

<sup>5</sup> See p. 102 note 2.

<sup>6</sup> The manor of Plesaunce in Greenwich, which later formed part of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's dowry, had formerly been enjoyed by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (*Rot. Parl.* v. 627b).

*Feodifirma de le Quenehithe in London*

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Ricardo Lee et Ricardo Allee, nuper vicecomitibus ciuitatis Londonie, per manus Edwardi Ellesmere xiiij<sup>o</sup> die Februarij anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, de quadam summa x.li. per annum eidem Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes<sup>1</sup> concessa parcella quinquaginta librarum feodifirme ripe Regine Londonie, percipienda a xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarij anno xxv<sup>to</sup> annuatim per manus maioris et communitalis ciuitatis Londonie aut per manus vicecomitum comitatus Londonie et Middlesex siue aliorum occupatorum aut receptorum eiusdem ripe siue firme pro tempore existencium ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones, videlicet, de huiusmodi feodi firma, tam ab eodem xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarij anno xxv<sup>to</sup> vsque festum Pasche tunc proxime sequentem, accidentem ix<sup>no</sup> die Aprilis, per xliiij dies iuxta ratam dictarum x.li. per idem tempus, quam ab eodem festo Pasche vsque festum Sancti Michelis anno xxix<sup>no</sup>, scilicet pro terminis Michelis et Pasche anno xxvj<sup>to</sup>, Michelis et Pasche anno xxvij<sup>o</sup>, Michelis et Pasche anno xxviii<sup>o</sup>, et Michelis anno xxix<sup>no</sup> infra tempus accidentibus, per indenturam penes eosdem remanentem xxxv.li.xviii.s.xl.d.ob.

De xxx.li. de dicta firma x.li. per annum eidem Regine in forma predicta pro termino vite sue concessis, et eidem pro annis xxx<sup>o</sup>, xxxj<sup>mo</sup>, et xxxij<sup>do</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitis, non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus maioris communitalis et vicecomitum ciuitatis predictae nondum solute. De quibus quidem xxx.li. predicti maior communitas et vicecomites ciuitatis predictae per tempus predictum existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Nec reddit de xxx.li.,<sup>2</sup> parcella l.li feodifirme ripe Regine Londonie percipienda annuatim in forma supradicta prefate Regine per dictum Regem Henricum sextum in recompensationem supradicti domanij de Pembrok' a festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> Regis predicti ad terminem vite sue in partem dotis sue concessae auctoritate parlamenti sui apud Redyng inchoati et tenti dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup>, per literas suas patentes soluende terminis Pasche et sancti Michelis equaliter, videlicet, per predictum tempus huius compoti, eo quod remanent in manibus predictorum maioris communitalis et vicecomitum ciuitatis predictae nondum solute. De quibus xxx.li. predicti maior communitas et vicecomites ciuitatis predictae per tempus supradictum debent Regine respondere. Et recepit nihil.

Summa———xxxv.li.xviii.s.xj.d.ob.

Summa pagine———cxliiij.li.xiiij.s.xj.d.

fol. 3b

*Feodifirma ville Norhampton*<sup>3</sup>

De Willelmo Clerk et Thoma Dauentr', nuper balliuis ibidem per manus Johannis Norrys penultimo die Nouembris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, de quadam summa x.li. per annum eidem Regine prefate Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes concessa, parcella

<sup>1</sup> This grant was confirmed for life by letters patent dated 28 February 1452 (C.P.R., 1446-1452, p. 559). Nevertheless the payments were in arrears.

<sup>2</sup> Rot. Parl. v. 262b.

<sup>3</sup> C.P.R., 1446-1452, p. 559. Cf. note 1 above.

illarum centum et viginti librarum feodifirme ville Norhampton siue firme ville Norhampton quam burgenses siue homines eiusdem ville pro eadem villa Regi et heredibus suis annuatim reddere tenentur, percipienda a xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarij anno xxv<sup>to</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti per manus burgensium hominum seu balliuorum aut aliorum receptorum, firmariorum, siue occupatorum ville predictae pro tempore existencium ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones, videlicet, tam ab eodem xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarij anno xxv<sup>to</sup> vsque festum Pasche tunc proxime sequentem, accidentem nono die Aprilis, per xliij dies, iuxta ratam dictarum x.li. per annum, per idem tempus quam ab eodem festo Pasche vsque festum Sancti Michelis anno xxx<sup>mo</sup>, scilicet pro terminis Michelis et Pasche anno xxvj<sup>to</sup>, Michelis et Pasche xxvij<sup>o</sup>, Michelis et Pasche anno xxviii<sup>o</sup>, Michelis et Pasche anno xxix<sup>o</sup>, et Michelis anno xxx<sup>mo</sup>, infra tempus accidentibus, per indenturam penes ipsos remanentem———xlvj.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

De xx.li. de quadam summa x.li. per annum, de parte cxx.li. feodifirme ville predictae eidem Regine in forma supradicta pro termino vite sue concessae, et sibi pro hoc anno et anno proxime precedente debite hoc anno non reddit, eo quod restant nondum solute. De quibus quidem xx.li. balliui ville predictae per tempus predictum existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Summa———xlvj.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

*Annua pensione abbatis de Oseney*<sup>1</sup>

Et de abbate et conuentu de Oseney per manus Edwardi Ellesmere penultimo die Januarij supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> de illis x.li. annuis, parcella illarum viginti librarum annuarum quas abbas et conuentus de Oseney qui de patronatu Regis existit, Regi et heredibus suis reddere tenentur per annum de siue pro medietate duorum molendinorum aquaticorum subtus castrum Oxonie et toto prato iuxta Oseney vocato Kyngesmede ac medietate cuiusdam piscarie vocata Themse a ponte vocato Hidebrugge vsque eadem molendia que Ricardus Foreste nuper tenuit ad terminum vite sue ex concessione Regis pro viginti libris Regi annuatim reddendis, percipiendis annuatim eidem Regine decem libras illas a predicto xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarii dicto anno xxv<sup>to</sup> pro termino vite sue per manus eiusdem abbatis et successorum suorum aut aliorum occupatorum, firmariorum, siue receptorum molendinorum predictorum, aut firme predictae ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones, videlicet in persolutione dictarum x.li. pro hoc anno, per indenturam penes ipsos abbatem et conuentum remanentem———x.li.

Summa———x.li.

*Manerium de Feckenham*<sup>2</sup>

De aliquibus denariorum summis per ipsum recepturis de officiariis et ministris Regine ibidem hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos huiusmodi denarios (sic) ad manus dicti receptoris generalis per tempus predictum minime liberati fuerunt, vt dicit super sacramentum suum———nihil.

Summa pagine———lvj.li.xj.s.iiij.d.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> The manor of Feckenham should have produced £25 6s. 8d. a year (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 340).

fol. 4a

*Feodifirma ville de Scardeburgh et ville de Walgrave*<sup>1</sup>

De clxxij.li.xiiij.s.ij.d. de quadam summa xxvij.li. eidem Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes concessa, percipienda annuatim a predicto xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Februarij anno xxv<sup>to</sup> pro termino vite sue tam de feodifirma villa de Scardeburgh quam de feodifirma ville de Walgrave alias dicte Wallesgrave alias dicte Waldegrave et sexaginta acrarum terrarum cum pertinentibus per manus burgensium hominum siue balliuorum eiusdem ville aut aliorum receptorum firmariorum siue occupatorum ville manerij et terrarum predictarum pro tempore existentium ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones et eidem Regine pro hoc anno et vj annis precedentis debita vltra xvj.li.v.s.x.d. de parte dictarum xxvij.li. anno xxvj<sup>to</sup> debitorum per manus Johannis Lumbard et Roberti Ammlith balliuorum ville predictae anno xxvij<sup>o</sup> eiusdem Regis soluturarum hoc anno non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus balliuorum eiusdem ville nondum solute, vnde ijdem balliui ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit *nihil*.

*Feodifirma ville Bristoll*<sup>2</sup>

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Johanne Stanley, nuper maiore ville Bristoll', in persolucionem cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. de feodifirma ville predictae per annum prefate Regine pro termino vite sue in partem dotis sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum concessa, percipienda annuatim de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus, firmis, et quibuscumque alijs commoditatibus ville predictae per manus maioris balliuorum burgensium receptorum siue aliorum occupatorum quorumcumque eiusdem ville ad terminos Sancti Michelis et Pasche per equales porciones, et supradicte Regine pro termino Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> debitis, videlicet, pro eodem termino, per acquietanciam penes dictum Johannem maiorem ville predictae eodem anno remanentem—li.li.vij.s.ix.d.

Et de Willelmo Codder, nuper maiore ville Bristoll', in persolucionem cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. de feodifirma ville predictae prefate Regine in forma predicta concessa, percipienda annuatim, vt supra, et eidem pro hoc anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> debito, videlicet, pro supradictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus predictum accidentibus ad ij vices, vna vice iiij<sup>to</sup> die Decembris dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, li.li.vij.s.ix.d. et altera vice die (sic) eodem anno, li.li.vij.s.ix.d. per ij inden-turas penes dictum Willelmum remanentes—cij.li.xv.s.vj.d.

Summa—cliiij.li.iijs.iiij.d.

*Firma et incrementum ville Suthampton*<sup>3</sup>

Et de Thoma Payne, nuper vicecomite ville predictae, de quadam summa c.li. de firma et incremento eiusdem ville per annum prefate Regine concessa, habenda et percipienda annuatim a dicto festo sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> pro termino vite

<sup>1</sup> C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 559. Cf. p. 106 note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Queen Elizabeth Wydeville was in 1467 assigned the same sum from this source (*Rot. Parl.* v. 625a).

<sup>3</sup> These revenues from Southampton, Norwich, Ipswich, Nottingham, and Derby were all part of the compensation for the loss of Pembroke, assigned to Margaret in the Parliament of Reading in 1453 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 262b).



sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter in recompensacionem supradicti domanij de Pembroke cum membris, videlicet, pro dictis terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus compoti accidentibus——c.li.

Summa——c.li.

Summa pagine——ccliij.li.iiij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 4b

*Feodifirma ciuitatis Norwici* <sup>1</sup>

Et de denariis receptis de Thoma Elys et Roberto Sirede, nuper vicecomitatibus ciuitatis Norwici, de quadam summa centum marcarum de feodi firma ciuitatis Norwici siue de firma ville Norwici per annum prefate Regine concessa, habenda et percipienda a dicto festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> pro termino vite sue per manus ciuium ciuitatis aut ville predictae pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus compoti accidentibus per indenturam penes eosdem remanentem

lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Summa——lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

*Firma ville Gippewici* <sup>2</sup>

Et de (sic) ville Gippewici, in partem solucionis xxxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. per annum concessis, habendis et percipiendis a dicto festo sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> pro termino vite sue per manus burgensium eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et sancti Michelis equaliter——xx.li.

De xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. residuis dictorum xxxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. de firma ville predictae prefate Regine in forma predicta concessis non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus dictorum burgensium nondum soluti. De quibus quidem xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d. burgenses ville predictae debent Regine respondere. Et recepit——nihil.

Summa——xx.li.

*Firma ville Notyngham* <sup>3</sup>

De xl.li. de firma ville Notyngham supradictae Regine concessis, habendis et percipiendis annuatim a supradicto festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> pro termino vite sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus hominum eiusdem ville nondum solute. De quibus quidem xl.li. homines ville predictae debent Regine respondere. Et recepit——nihil.

*Firma ville Derb'* <sup>4</sup>

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Johanne Weston et Stephano Thomson nuper balliuis ville Derb' de parte xxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. de firma ville Derb' prefate Regine concessorum, habendorum et percipiendorum annuatim a dicto festo

<sup>1</sup> These revenues from Southampton, Norwich, Ipswich, Nottingham, and Derby were all part of the compensation for the loss of Pembroke, assigned to Margaret in the Parliament of Reading in 1453 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 262b).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

Sancti Michelis anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> pro termino vite sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium in recompensacione dicti domanij de Pembroke cum membris ad festa predicta equaliter, per indenturam penes dictos balliuos remanentem—xvij.li.viiij.d.

De ix.li.xij.s.viiij.d. residuis dictorum xxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. de firma ville prefate Regine in forma predicta concessis non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus hominum eiusdem ville nondum soluti. De quibus quidem ix.li.xij.s.viiij.d. iidem homines ville prefate debent Regine respondere. Et recepit—nihil.

Summa—xvij.li.viiij.d.

Summa pagine—ciii.li.xiiij.s.

fol. 5a

*Recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Lancastrie* <sup>1</sup>

Set reddit de denariis receptoris de Willelmo Cotton <sup>2</sup> armigero, receptore generali domini Regis Ducatus sui Lancastrie, in persolucionem M.li. prefate Regine concessarum, habendarum et percipiendarum eidem Regine ad terminum vite sue annuatim ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis in partem dotis sue de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus omnium reddituum castrorum, domaniorum, maneriorum, terrarum, et tenementorum honorum, reddituum hereditamentorum et aliorum emolumentorum quorumcumque dicti Ducatus Lancastrie tam in Anglia quam in Wallia in manibus Regis existencium et remanencium, vltra predicta castra domania terras et tenementa ac cetera premissa parcelle ducatus predicti in partem dotis sue assignate, per manus receptoris generalis ducatus predicti pro tempore existencis—M.li.

Et de eodem Willelmo receptore generali dicti ducatus vt pro annuitate, D marce concesse prefate Regine ad terminum vite sue, percipiende annuatim de omnibus castris, honoribus, domanijs, manerijs, terris, et tenementis, redditibus, et seruicijs ducatus predicti ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus compoti accidentibus

cccxxxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Summa—M.cccxxxiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

*Recepta denariorum de custumis in portu ville Suthampton* <sup>3</sup>

De Thoma Cooke et Johanne Somerton, collectoribus custume et subsidii in portu ville Suthampton, in persolucionem ccxx.li.vij.s.xj.d. anno xxvij<sup>o</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti prefate Regine debitorum de parte M.li. de illis MMMDclxvj. li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis eidem Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones in partem dotis sue, videlicet, dictarum M.li. tam de paruis quam de magnis custumis Regis heredum et successorum suorum in predicto portu ville Suthampton per manus collectorum earundem customarum pro tempore existencium xx die Octobris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup>, per indenturam penes customarios predictos remanentem—ccxx.li.vij.s.xj.d.

Et de eisdem collectoribus per manus Johannis Norrys xx<sup>mo</sup> die Octobris dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> in persolucionem M.li. anno xxix<sup>mo</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti

<sup>1</sup> Part of the original dowry of 1446 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 119b, 120a).

<sup>2</sup> See p. 99 note 4.

<sup>3</sup> See note 1.

prefate Regine debitarum et sibi concessarum in forma supradicta, percipiendarum ad terminos predictos ut supra, per indenturam penes dictos customarios remanentem———M.li.

Et de eisdem collectoribus de parte M.li. anno xxx<sup>mo</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitarum prefate Regine et sibi concessarum, percipiendarum modo et forma supradictis ad terminos supradictos equaliter ad vj vices, videlicet, prima vice predicto xx<sup>o</sup> die Octobris anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> cclxxix.li.xij.s.i.d., secunda vice dictis die et anno xlvij.li.xij.s.iiij.d., tertia vice xxiiij<sup>to</sup> die Januarij eodem anno c.li., per tres indenturas penes eosdem remanentes———ccccxxviii.li.v.s.v.d.

De Dlxxj.li.xiiij.s.vij.d. residuis dictarum M.li. concessarum et assignatarum dicte Regine in forma supradicta et eidem pro dicto anno xxx<sup>mo</sup> debitarum non reddit, eo quod restant in manibus dictorum collectorum nondum soluti. De quibus quidem Dlxxj.li.xiiij.s.vij.d. iidem collectores vel collector ibidem pro tempore debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.<sup>1</sup>

Nec reddit de MM.li. eidem Regine pro hoc anno et anno proxime precedente debitis de supradictis MMMDclxvj.li.xij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis dicte Regine in partem dotis sue in forma supradicta, eo quod restant in manibus collectorum predictorum nondum soluti. De quibus quidem MM.li. iidem collectores vel collector ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Summa———MDcxlviij.li.xij.s.iiij.d.

Summa pagine———<sup>xx</sup>MMDcccciiij.li.

fol. 5b

*Recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Cornubie* <sup>2</sup>

De clxvij.li.xij.s.j.d. de parte ciiijxiiij.li.xij.s.j.d. de illis cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. prefate Margarete Regine ad terminum vite sue concessis percipiendis annuatim de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus ducatus predicti ac de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus cunagij stanni in comitatibus Cornubie et Deuonie per manus generalis receptoris ibidem et quorumcumque aliorum receptorum, occupatorum, siue firmariorum eorundem proficuum et reuencuum pro tempore existencium in recompensacionem cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. diuersorum annuitatum diuersis personis ad terminum vite separatim concessarum de castris, domanijs, manerijs, terris, et tenementis ac alijs parcellis Ducatus Regis Lancastrie predictae Regine in partem sue dotis assignatis et eidem pro anno xxix<sup>mo</sup> dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitis et non plus quam xxvj.li. de annuitate Thome Gresley chualero deuenta in manibus Regine per mortem eiusdem deducuntur et defalcantur non reddit, eo quod restant in manibus dicti Johannis Breknok <sup>3</sup> generalis receptoris dicti

<sup>1</sup> In 1454 it was enacted that Margaret should have first claim on the customs of Southampton for her thousand pounds; for she had been unable to collect this sum in 1451 and 1452 owing to the fact that in 1451 it had been enacted that the king was to be preferred in payment of £20,000 from the customs of Southampton and London for two years from Christmas, 1450 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 259, 214).

<sup>2</sup> The original grant in 1446 from the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall was £108 15s. 5d. a year (*Rot. Parl.* v. 120b).

<sup>3</sup> See Somerville, *op. cit.* p. 642; Wedgwood, *op. cit.* pp. 106-7.

Ducatus nondum soluti. De quibus quidem clxij.li.xij.s.j.d. idem Johannes debet respondere. Et recepit—————nihil.

Nec reddit de xliij.li.x.d. de parte <sup>xx</sup>iiijxv.li.xiiij.s.ij.d. de supradictis cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. prefate Regine ad terminum vite sue concessis, percipiendis annuatim vt supra et eidem pro anno xxx<sup>mo</sup> dicti nunc Regis debitis et non plus quia xxvj.li. de annuitate dicti Thome Cresley per mortem eiusdem et xxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. de annuitate Johannis Penycoke, armigeri, auctoritate parlamenti anno xxix<sup>mo</sup> eiusdem Regis tento resumpta deuenta in manibus Regine deducuntur et defalcantur, eo quod restant in manibus dicti Johannis nondum soluti. De quibus quidem xliij.li.x.d. idem Johannes debet Regine respondere. Et recepit—————nihil.

Nec reddit de xliij.li.x.d. de parte cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. prefate Regine ad terminum vite sue concessis, percipiendis annuatim modo quo supra eidem Regine anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> debitis et non plus quia <sup>xx</sup>cciiij.li.x.s.v.d. de annuitate diuersarum personarum deuenta in manibus Regine per mortem eorundem eodem anno deducuntur et defalcantur, quarum nomina et summe in vna cedula compoto de dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> consuta annotantur, eo quod restant in manibus dicti Johannis nondum soluti. De quibus quidem xliij.li.x.d. idem Johannes debet Regine respondere. Et recepit—————nihil.

Nec reddit de xliij.li.x.d. de parte cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. prefate Regine ut supra concessis percipiendis annuatim modo et forma predictis ac eidem Regine pro hoc anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> debitis et non plus causa supradicta, eo quod restant in manibus dicti Johannis nondum soluti. De quibus quidem xliij.li.x.d. idem Johannes debet Regine respondere. Et recepit—————nihil.

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de predicto Johanne Breknok armigero, generali receptore dicti Ducatus Cornubie, in persolucionem Mvii.li.xv.s.v.d. de quadam summa MMMDclxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. concessa et assignata dicte Regine habenda et percipienda annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis archangeli per equales porciones in partem dotis sue videlicet dictorum Mvii.li.xv.s.v.d. de exitibus, reuencibus, et proficuis stannarie et cunagij stanni in comitatibus Cornubie et Deuonie per manus receptoris generalis sui heredum et successorum suorum eiusdem Ducatus et quorumcumque aliorum receptorum, occupatorum, siue firmariorum eorundem proficuorum exituum et reuencuum et dicte domine Regine anno proxime precedenti debitis, vltra Dccclxj.li.xv.s.vj.d.ob. eodem anno oneratur xv<sup>o</sup> die Maij dicto anno xxxj<sup>mo</sup> per manus Thome Scotte per indenturam penes dictum Johannem remanentem cxlvj.li.xix.s.x.d.ob.

Summa pagine—————cxlvj.li.xix.s.x.d.ob.

fol. 6a

*Adhuc recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Cornubie*

Et de eodem Johanne Breknok in partem solucionis Mvii.li.xv.s.v.d. concessorum et assignatorum dicte Regine, habendorum et percipiendorum vt supra ad terminos supradictos equaliter in partem dotis sue et eidem Regine pro hoc anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> debitis ad vij vices, videlicet, prima vice per manus Johannis dominj de Duddeley thesaurarij hospicii Regis penultimo die Octobris supradicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> D.li., secunda vice decimo die Nouembris eodem anno per manus Johannis



domini de Stourton cc.li., tercia vice xv<sup>o</sup> die Decembris eodem anno per manus  
Johannis Wode c.li., quarta vice dictis die et anno per manus eiusdem Johannis  
l.li., quinta vice die et anno predictis per manus Thome Scotte lx.s.j.d.ob., sexta  
vice xvij<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis dicto anno xxxij<sup>do</sup> per manus Johannis Hardewik xxiiij.li.xix.s.  
vij.d., et septima vice xxvj<sup>to</sup> die Aprilis eodem anno per manus Johannis Pury  
x.li. per vij indenturas penes dictum Johannem remanentem

<sup>xx</sup>  
Dccciiijvj.li.xix.s.vij.d.ob.

De cxxj.li.xv.s.vij.d.ob. residuis predictorum Mviiij.li.xv.s.v.d. prefate Regine  
hoc anno vt supra debitis non receptis, eo quod restant nondum soluti. De  
quibus quidem cxxj.li.xv.s.vij.d.ob. predictis Johannes debet Regine respondere.  
Et recepit—————nihil.

<sup>xx</sup>  
Summa—————Dccciiijvj.li.xix.s.vij.d.ob.

(To be continued)

## THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS<sup>1</sup>

By H. H. ROWLEY, M.A., B.LITT., D.D., THEOL.D., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MANCHESTER

NEARLY fifty years ago Solomon Schechter published some fragments of a work which had been found in the famous Cairo Genizah.<sup>2</sup> These fragments were of two manuscripts of different dates, the one being commonly dated in the tenth century A.D., and the other in the eleventh or twelfth century. In part they duplicated one another, though there are variations in the text. Schechter called them *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, because they emanated from people who called themselves the Sons of Zadok.<sup>3</sup> They contain references to a migration to Damascus of the sect from which the work came, and to a covenant entered into by members of the sect, who are therefore sometimes called the Covenanters of Damascus, and in continental works the fragments are usually called the *Damaskusschrift*. The work itself falls into two clearly defined parts, described by

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 13th February 1957. The following abbreviations are used in the notes below :

B.A. = *The Biblical Archaeologist* ; B.J.R.L. = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* ; C.R.A.I. = *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* ; E.Th.L. = *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* ; H.T.R. = *Harvard Theological Review* ; I.L.N. = *Illustrated London News* ; J.B.L. = *Journal of Biblical Literature* ; J.J.S. = *Journal of Jewish Studies* ; J.Q.R. = *Jewish Quarterly Review* ; J.T.S. = *Journal of Theological Studies* ; N.R.Th. = *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* ; N.T.S. = *New Testament Studies* ; P.E.Q. = *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* ; R.B. = *Revue Biblique* ; R.H.R. = *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* ; Th.L.Z. = *Theologische Literaturzeitung* ; T.T. = *Theologisch Tijdschrift* ; V.D. = *Verbum Domini* ; V.T. = *Vetus Testamentum* ; Z.R.G.G. = *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*. The literature on the Scrolls is so enormous that any full reference to the discussions on the various points is impossible. I have therefore kept the notes to the minimum, and apologize to the host of unmentioned scholars who could be cited for or against the views I have discussed.

<sup>2</sup> *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I : *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (1910).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. vi. 2 (p. III, lines 4 f.) : "the sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel, called by name, who shall arise at the end of the days".

Dr. Rabin in his recent excellent edition of the fragments<sup>1</sup> as "The Admonition" and "The Laws". It therefore bore some resemblance in structure to the book of Deuteronomy, which contains a long historical survey expressed in terms of exhortation, followed by a code of laws.

This hitherto unknown work attracted much attention from scholars, who soon differed widely as to the date of the composition of the work and the particular group from which it came.<sup>2</sup> By most writers it was believed that the medieval manuscripts were copies of a much older work, and by some its composition was ascribed to the second century B.C.<sup>3</sup> Writing in 1944, long before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, I expressed the view that its composition fell within the century and a half before the Christian era.<sup>4</sup>

The Zadokite Work tells us that God visited His people some 390 years after He had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, and caused a root to issue from Israel and Aaron.<sup>5</sup> This root was the sect from which the Zadokite Work came. We read that after the sect had groped like blind men for twenty years God raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>6</sup> It might seem at first sight that here we have a definite date, and some scholars accepted this as reliable evidence. They therefore dated the beginning of the sect in 196 B.C., and the rise of the Teacher of

<sup>1</sup> *The Zadokite Documents* (1954).

<sup>2</sup> Dates ranging from the second century B.C. to the eleventh century A.D. were proposed. For references to the advocates of the various dates cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 1 f. The sect from which the work came was variously identified with the Pharisees, the Zealots, the Dositheans, the Sadducees, the followers of John the Baptist, and the Karaites, while the affinities with the Essenes were also noted. For references to the relevant literature, cf. *ibid.* pp. 79 n., 56 n., 2 n., 46 n.

<sup>3</sup> So E. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus* (1919), and *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 4th edn. ii (1925), 47 ff.; H. Gressmann, in Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 3rd edn. (1926), p. 15; W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.* xii (1910-11), 301 ff.; G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 330 ff.; B. D. Eerdmans, *T.T.* xlv (1911), 282 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), p. 72 (2nd edn. (1911), p. 74).

<sup>5</sup> i. 5 (p. i, lines 5 ff.). I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxiii (1954), 11 ff., has advanced the view that the reference is to a period of 390 years before Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem. In a forthcoming paper in the volume in memory of A. Robert I examine this question and offer reasons for rejecting this view.

<sup>6</sup> i. 6 f. (p. i, lines 9 ff.).

Righteousness in 176 B.C.<sup>1</sup> This, however, is much too simple. All our ancient Jewish sources are defective in their knowledge of the chronology of the post-exilic period,<sup>2</sup> and we cannot assume that here we have a reliable figure. If it should prove to be approximately accurate, it is more likely that this is an accident than that it rests on precise calculation.<sup>3</sup> The 390 years should therefore be left out of account in any discussion of the date of the Teacher of Righteousness. On the other hand, the twenty years of groping is probably a reliable approximation, since the sect might be expected to know its own history, and since there is evidence that the Zadokite Work comes from a date within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.

When the Dead Sea Scrolls were found in 1947, and came to the knowledge of scholars in 1948, attention was quickly drawn to the fact that the Teacher of Righteousness figures here also. In the Habakkuk Commentary, which was the first of the Scrolls to be published in full, there are several references to him and his enemies, and the view immediately gained ground that the Scrolls and the Zadokite Work emanated from one and the same sect. It may be added that some fragments of the Zadokite Work have now been found amongst the Qumran manuscripts,<sup>4</sup> and it is certain, therefore, that this work was known to, and treasured by, the Qumran community. Since these new fragments are many centuries older than those found in Cairo, the view that those medieval fragments were copies of a much older work has found confirmation.

Much controversy raged at first about the problems of dating raised by the Scrolls, and there was the widest possible range of opinion, some scholars dating the placing of the Scrolls in the cave—only one cave was in question at first—in the beginning of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes*, pp. 13 f.; R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ii (1913), 792, 800.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 62, 64, and G. Vermès, *Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (1953), p. 76 (Eng. trans. (1956), p. 72).

<sup>3</sup> J. Teicher, *J.J.S.* iv, No. 2 (1953), 51, accuses me of wanting to eat my cake and have it because I find that it is approximately correct. I make it clear, however, that any approximation to accuracy which it may have is quite accidental, and I do not base myself on this figure in reaching my conclusions.

<sup>4</sup> Some of these fragments have been published by M. Baillet in *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 513 ff.



the first century B.C.,<sup>1</sup> while others dated the composition of some of the works here preserved as late as the Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup> We have to remember that there is no reason to suppose that the manuscripts which have now come to light were the original autographs of their authors, and hence several different dates must be borne in mind. There is the date of the life and work of the Teacher of Righteousness, the date of the composition of the works which refer to him, the date of the making of the particular copies that have been found, and the date of the deposit of these manuscripts in the caves.

So far as the last of these dates is concerned, there is now full assurance. All the manuscripts which come from the sect which was led by the Teacher of Righteousness were found in the neighbourhood of Qumran. In other areas some distance away, at Murabba'at and El Mird, other finds have been made, but there is nothing to connect any of these with the sect from which the Zadokite Work or the sectarian documents of Qumran came. The manuscripts which first came to light were sold in Jerusalem by dealers, who said they had come from one of the Qumran caves, where they had been stored in jars, and two jars were sold to Professor Sukenik, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. These jars were declared by the experts to be unique.<sup>3</sup> When the cave was later examined by archaeologists of international repute, they found some fragments of manuscripts buried beneath accumulations of dust and dirt which had long been undisturbed. Some of the fragments were of the same manuscripts that had been sold by the dealers. Moreover, they found fragments of jars which, when reconstructed, proved to be similar to those bought by Dr. Sukenik. There could therefore be no reasonable doubt that the manuscripts and the jars had indeed come from the cave.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 234, 586 ff.; O. R. Sellers, *B.A.* xii (1949), 8; G. Lankester Harding, *I.L.N.*, 1 October (1949), p. 493.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, xxxix (1948-49), 235 ff., 337 ff., xl (1949-50), 57 ff., 291 ff., 373 ff., xli (1950-51), 1 ff., 251 ff., 449, and *Crozer Quarterly*, xxvi (1950), 35 ff.; P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, xli (1950-51), 125 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 587 ff. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Eng. trans. p. 15 (French text, p. 21): "The shape of the jars is without parallel among the Hellenistic types previously known."

Soon the archaeologists excavated a nearby ruined site, and found buried deep in the ruins a jar similar to those which had come from the cave, and a room in which were tables and inkpots, still containing the remains of dried ink.<sup>1</sup> There could now be no possible doubt that the manuscripts had come from the people who used the building, which must have been a centre for the people of the sect. It is not correctly described as a monastery, though the term is often used for convenience. It was certainly the centre for the Qumran community, and it has yielded clear evidence as to the date when the sect ceased to use it. For it contains a large number of coins, ranging in date from the end of the second century B.C. to the year A.D. 68. Then the building was laid in ruins. But part of it was quickly rebuilt on a different plan and occupied. Here Roman coins covering a few years after A.D. 68 were found, and it is believed that the occupiers were now Roman soldiers.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore confidently believed that the sect of the Scrolls vanished from Qumran in A.D. 68, and hence that all the manuscripts must have been deposited in the caves by that date.<sup>3</sup>

This means that the various processes I have outlined must have reached their final termination by A.D. 68. Some of the manuscripts had been long in use before they were placed in the caves and abandoned. We are therefore carried back far before A.D. 68 for the copying of these manuscripts. We must then go back before that for the time of the composition of the sectarian texts, while the time of the life and work of the Teacher of Righteousness lies beyond that again. It is therefore as sure as anything can yet be that the Teacher of Righteousness lived before the beginning of the Christian era. Accordingly, of the many attempts to place him in a historical setting we may leave out of account all which date him later than this. We are still

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *C.R.A.I.* (1952), pp. 173 ff., and *R.B.* lxi (1954), 206 ff., lxiii (1956), 533 ff.; G. Lankester Harding, *I.L.N.*, 3 September (1955), p. 379.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 565 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. de Vaux, *ibid.* p. 567: "La plupart de ces monnaies (of the level before the destruction) sont de la II<sup>e</sup> année de la Révolte mais, dans chaque groupe, deux monnaies sont de la III<sup>e</sup> année. Celle-ci a commencé au printemps de 68 ap. J.-C. Or nous avons conclu des données de Josèphe que Khirbet Qumran avait été pris par les Romains en juin 68: on ne peut souhaiter un meilleur accord de l'archéologie avec l'histoire."

left with three principal views. One locates him in the time of the struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes in the early part of the second century B.C.; a second locates him in the time of Alexander Jannaeus about a century later; a third locates him a little later, and places his death in the time of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II, towards the middle of the first century B.C. Before we turn to examine these three views, we may see briefly what we are told in the texts about the Teacher of Righteousness and his times.

In the Zadokite Work we read that the Teacher was raised up to lead the sect and "to make known to the last generations what He (i.e. God) would do<sup>1</sup> to the last generation, the congregation of the evildoers".<sup>2</sup> It would therefore appear that the sect believed that it had come into existence at the climax of the ages. This is borne out by what we find elsewhere in this work, where it is said that the Sons of Zadok are "the elect of Israel . . . who shall arise at the end of the days".<sup>3</sup> We learn little about the Teacher of Righteousness, save that he gave true teaching, and none of the details of his life are recorded. That he had died when the Zadokite Work was composed is clear, since there is a reference to the period from the day when the Teacher was gathered in until a Messiah should arise from Aaron and Israel.<sup>4</sup> He is not called the Teacher of Righteousness here, but the Unique Teacher, which may be a scribal error for the Teacher of the Community.<sup>5</sup> Some scholars think the expression "the

<sup>1</sup> The manuscript has "had done", but C. Rabin, *op. cit.* p. 5, conjectures that a letter has fallen out, and renders as above. So also A. Dupont-Sommer, *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> i. 8 (p. i, lines 11 f.).

<sup>3</sup> vi. 2 (p. iii, lines 4 f.).

<sup>4</sup> ix. 29 B (pp. xix, line 35, xx, line 1).

<sup>5</sup> So S. M. Stern, *J.B.L.* lxix (1950), 24; L. Rost, *Th.L.Z.* lxxviii (1953), 144; G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes* (1954), p. 57. Rabin, *op. cit.* p. 37, while recognizing this possibility, is cautious, and uncertain whether the Unique Teacher is the Teacher of Righteousness or another. T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (1956), pp. 72, 103, renders "the teacher of the community" but holds that he is distinct from the Teacher of Righteousness and a future prophetic teacher. L. Rost, *loc. cit.* cols. 143 ff., also differentiates the two teachers. R. H. Charles, *op. cit.* pp. 800 f. identifies the Unique Teacher with the Teacher of Righteousness, and so Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1950), p. 78 (Eng. trans. by E. M. Rowley (1952), p. 63), and this view seems to me the more probable.

Messiah . . . from Aaron and Israel " should be corrected to "the Messiahs . . . ", since we find the plural elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> This need not detain us here, especially since it is conjectural. More relevant to our purpose is it to note that in another passage we read that a period of forty years should elapse between the death of the Unique Teacher until all the men of war who returned with the Man of the Lie should be consumed.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore clear that the Zadokite Work was composed at some time during that forty years.

We are given little information about the Man of the Lie. Dr. Rabin notes that a comparable term in Arabic stands for Antichrist, and thinks the "Man of Sin" in 2 Thess. ii. 3 is a Greek rendering of the same term.<sup>3</sup> The Man of the Lie in the Zadokite Work is a military figure, since he is accompanied by men of war. Elsewhere we meet the "Man of Scorn",<sup>4</sup> who "caused the waters of untruth to drip to Israel",<sup>5</sup> and a "dripper of untruth",<sup>6</sup> by which expression a false prophet may be meant. For the verb "to drip" is used in the Old Testament of prophesying. Amongst the enemies of the sect we find also reference to those who "dripped lies".<sup>7</sup>

In one passage there is mention of the kings of the nations, and of the chief of the kings of Greece, who came to wreak vengeance upon those who rebelled.<sup>8</sup> All this offers us very meagre information about the Teacher of Righteousness and his

<sup>1</sup> So J. T. Milik, *V.D.* xxix (1951), 152. The plural is found in the *Manual of Discipline*, col. IX, line 11, and this is commonly understood to mean the Messiah of Israel and the Messiah of Aaron, or the lay and priestly Messiahs (so G. Vermès, *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda* (1953), p. 118 (Eng. trans. (1956), p. 116); M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1955), pp. 264 f.; T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 58; cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1953), pp. 80 f.n. (Eng. trans. by R. D. Barnett (1954), p. 54 n.). W. S. la Sor, *V.T.* vi (1956), 425 ff. combats this view and holds that it means "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" where "anointed ones" is deliberately spelled without capital letters.

<sup>2</sup> ix. 39 B (col. XX, lines 14 f.).

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> i. 10 (p. i, line 14); in ix. 36 B (p. xx, line 11) the plural of this expression is found.

<sup>5</sup> i. 10 (p. i, lines 14 f.).

<sup>6</sup> ix. 22 A (p. viii, line 13).

<sup>7</sup> viii. 1 (p. vi, line 1).

<sup>8</sup> ix. 20 (pp. viii, lines 10 f., xix, lines 23 f.).



times. We are given no indication of the length of his leadership of the sect.<sup>1</sup>

We may now turn to the Habakkuk Commentary found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls, to see what more we can glean about this Teacher. Here the text "the wicked man encompasses the righteous" is followed by the comment that the righteous man is the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>2</sup> Some words at the beginning of this comment are lost, and it is probable that they said that the wicked man is the Wicked Priest, to whom frequent reference is made elsewhere. From other references it is clear that he was a contemporary of the Teacher of Righteousness. We then read of those who acted treacherously with the Man of the Lie, and did not [. . .] the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>3</sup> The Man of the Lie figures again in the commentary later,<sup>4</sup> where the House of Absalom is condemned because they kept silence when the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted, and did not help him against the Man of the Lie.

Amongst the passages which refer to the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness there is one obscure and much disputed text which speaks of the persecution of the Teacher by the Wicked Priest,<sup>5</sup> and of the retribution which came upon the Wicked Priest for the wrong done to the Teacher and his followers.<sup>6</sup> God is said to have delivered the Priest into the hand of his enemies, afflicting him with a destroying scourge.<sup>7</sup>

Elsewhere we read that the Wicked Priest was "named according to the truth" when he first took office,<sup>8</sup> but later

<sup>1</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 24, attributes to him a leadership of forty years. This is to make the total period from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar to the coming of the Messiah tally with the four hundred and ninety years of Daniel—made up of the 390 years before the origin of the sect, *plus* the twenty years before the rise of the Teacher, *plus* these forty years of the leadership of the Teacher, *plus* the forty years after his death. This is very ingenious, but hardly convincing, since there is no reference to this period of 490 years anywhere in the literature of the sect, and no reference to the forty years of the Teacher's leadership. A deduction based on an assumption is hardly securely based. <sup>2</sup> Col. I, lines 12 f.

<sup>3</sup> Col. II, lines 1f. There is a gap in the text, which I have not attempted to fill, since we have no means of knowing what it was. <sup>4</sup> Col. V, line 11.

<sup>5</sup> Col. XI, lines 4 f.

<sup>6</sup> Col. XII, lines 2 f.

<sup>7</sup> Col. IX, lines 9 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Col. VIII lines, 8 f.

forsook God and plundered for his own enrichment, taking also "the wealth of the peoples".<sup>1</sup> This is then caught up into a wider reference to "the last priests of Jerusalem" who "gathered wealth from the spoil of the peoples", but whose wealth should be given at the end of the days to the army of the Kittim.<sup>2</sup> There is also an allusion to the Priest as one who walked in the ways of drunkenness,<sup>3</sup> and who wrought abominable works and defiled the sanctuary.<sup>4</sup> In one passage there is mention of the "dripper of untruth",<sup>5</sup> where the phrase is closely similar to that in the Zadokite Work, and this may once more indicate a false prophet.

In all this little is told us about the Teacher of Righteousness, with whom we are here principally concerned. These other figures are relevant to our inquiry only in so far as they may help us to discover the age in which the Teacher lived. Of the life and work of the Teacher, we know little save that he gave true and authoritative interpretation of the law to his followers and that he was opposed and persecuted by the Wicked Priest. Whether he was mortally persecuted depends on the interpretation of a doubtful passage, to which we shall return. One statement of the Habakkuk Commentary implies that he was a priest. This refers to those who do not believe the words of the priest, who by divine illumination interpreted the words of the prophets.<sup>6</sup> The priest is not here called the Teacher of Righteousness, but it is virtually certain that he is to be identified with him.<sup>7</sup> His function, like that of the Teacher of Righteousness, is to give true teaching, and since the Teacher figures so much in the rest of the Habakkuk Commentary it is likely that he, and not another interpreter of the Bible, is intended here. Moreover, while in this passage those who do not believe the priest are condemned, further on in the commentary we are told that those who are faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness should be saved.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Col. VIII, line 12.

<sup>2</sup> Col. IX, lines 5 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Col. XI, lines 13 f.

<sup>4</sup> Col. XII, lines 8 f.

<sup>5</sup> Col. X, line 9.

<sup>6</sup> Col. II, lines 6 ff.

<sup>7</sup> In a fragment of a commentary on Psalm xxxvii, published by J. M. Allegro in *P.E.Q.* lxxxvi (1954), 69 ff., we find a reference to "the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness" (col. II, line 15).

<sup>8</sup> Col. VIII, lines 2 f.

In the Habakkuk Commentary there are many references to the Kittim, and since these are of importance for the determination of the historical situation, we must traverse them here. They are said to be swift and powerful in battle,<sup>1</sup> dreaded of the nations they plundered,<sup>2</sup> cunning and deceitful,<sup>3</sup> and without belief in the ordinances of [God].<sup>4</sup> They come from afar, from the isles or coastlands,<sup>5</sup> they despise fortresses,<sup>6</sup> and their rulers come one after another to destroy the earth.<sup>7</sup> Again we are told that they gather wealth and booty like the fish of the sea,<sup>8</sup> and they sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons.<sup>9</sup> They are cruel and heartless, having no mercy on children.<sup>10</sup> I have already noted that they are brought into association with the Wicked Priest, or with the last priests of Jerusalem, in that it is said that all the ill-gotten gains of the priests shall be handed over to them.<sup>11</sup>

It is hard to escape the conclusion that the Kittim were active in Palestine in the days of the Teacher of Righteousness. They come into relation with the Wicked Priest, who was contemporary with the Teacher of Righteousness, and their intense cruelty does not seem to be something known to the writer by hearsay from abroad, but something which he had witnessed, and something that touched the sect as vitally as the treatment meted out to the Teacher of Righteousness. The Wicked Priest and the Kittim are alike the enemies and the persecutors of the sect, the one being the implacable foe of the Teacher of Righteousness, and the others the cruel tormentors of the members of the sect and their sympathisers. Yet the Wicked Priest is destined to be the victim of the Kittim. At one point of his career he was their tool; in the end all his ill-gotten wealth was destined to be poured into their lap.

In the Battle Scroll we find some further references to the Kittim. Here the Kittim of Assyria are linked with the troops of Edom, Moab, Ammon and Philistia<sup>12</sup> against the sons of Levi,

<sup>1</sup> Col. II, lines 12 f.

<sup>2</sup> Col. III, lines 5 f.

<sup>3</sup> Col. III, lines 10 f.

<sup>4</sup> Col. IV, lines 12 f.

<sup>5</sup> Col. VI, lines 3 f.

<sup>6</sup> Col. IX, lines 4 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Col. III, lines 4 f.

<sup>8</sup> Col. II, lines 14 f.

<sup>9</sup> Col. IV, lines 5 f.

<sup>10</sup> Col. VI, lines 1 f.

<sup>11</sup> Col. VI, lines 10 f.

<sup>12</sup> Col. I, lines 1 f.

Judah and Benjamin.<sup>1</sup> We learn of the Kittim in Egypt marching forth to fight against the kings of the north,<sup>2</sup> while elsewhere we find a reference to the king of the Kittim.<sup>3</sup>

In all this it is tantalizing to find no identifiable names of individuals. The house of Absalom might seem to offer us a personal name, though this is by no means sure. Some are of the opinion that it is an opprobrious term for someone who ignored the ties of natural kinship in an act which to the sect was as treacherous as Absalom's rebellion against his father. Even the term Kittim, as will be seen, is not of clearly defined significance. It is therefore both surprising and welcome that one of the latest texts to be published, a fragment of a Nahum Commentary,<sup>4</sup> contains for the first time the actual names of historical characters. Here we meet a king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the help of the seekers after smooth things.<sup>5</sup> The name of the king is partly lost, but the termination survives and makes it almost certain that it must have been Demetrius. In the next line we find a reference to the kings of Greece from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim.<sup>6</sup> Then we learn of one called the Young Lion of Wrath, who smites men down, and who is associated with the Seekers after Smooth things and hangs men alive.<sup>7</sup> There is a reference to the wealth which the (priests) of Jerusalem amassed,<sup>8</sup> and which is described as the prey of someone, apparently of the Young Lion of Wrath, though a short break in the text makes this uncertain.<sup>9</sup> It is probable that the hanging alive means crucifixion, and while this is not absolutely certain I shall accept it here.<sup>10</sup> It will be noted that I

<sup>1</sup> Col. I, line 2.

<sup>2</sup> Col. I, lines 3 f. The text is incomplete here, and Dupont-Sommer thinks it originally stated that *the king of the Kittim* in Egypt would march against the kings of the north. Cf. *Evidences*, No. 62 (January-February 1957), p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Col. XV, line 2.

<sup>4</sup> Published by J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 89 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Line 2.

<sup>6</sup> Line 3.

<sup>7</sup> Lines 5 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Line 11.

<sup>9</sup> In line 6 the comment on "he filled with prey" says that this concerns "the Young Lion of Wrath". When therefore line 11 interprets the word "prey" to mean the wealth of the (priests) of Jerusalem, it would seem that this wealth is to be seized by the Young Lion of Wrath.

<sup>10</sup> In *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 190 f., I argued that while it is not certain that the expression "hanged alive" means "crucified", it is probably that it has this



have not referred to the Teacher of Righteousness in connection with this text. That is for the simple and sufficient reason that he is not mentioned in it.

Some fragments of a Commentary on Psalm xxxvii contain references to a wicked person, who seems to have been the Wicked Priest, though again the text is broken, and only the final letter of the word for priest survives.<sup>1</sup> Apparently he is promised that he shall be delivered into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere in this commentary there is mention of the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who should put forth a hand against the priest and his associates.<sup>3</sup> Here the latter are promised deliverance, after which their adversaries shall be given into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles for judgement.<sup>4</sup> The priest and his associates must here be the members of the sect of the Scrolls, though whether the priest is the Teacher of Righteousness cannot be known with certainty. It is rendered highly probable by a passage in another fragment of the same Commentary.<sup>5</sup>

Here, it would seem, is meagre material from which to reconstruct the life of the Teacher of Righteousness or to identify his age. A few things, however, are clear. He lived at a time of deep inner cleavage amongst the Jews, when one party made itself the ally and tool of a foreign power, and when that foreign power was active in Palestine and cruelly tormenting members of the sect and

meaning. N. Wieder, *J.J.S.* vii (1956), 71 f., says there is no ground for my caution, since he has found a passage in *Sifre* where it clearly means "crucify". I recognized that the verb *tālāh* alone may mean "crucify", but does not necessarily have this meaning. The Oxford Hebrew Lexicon recognizes the meaning in Biblical Hebrew "put to death by hanging", where there is no reason to think of crucifixion. Anyone who is put to death by hanging is hanged alive, whether he be crucified or not, and the addition of the word "alive" cannot therefore prove that crucifixion is intended. As I have not disputed that the meaning here may be "crucified", and that this is the probable meaning, my caution was not dictated by desire to evade this meaning, but simply by the desire to avoid claiming greater certainty for it than it has.

<sup>1</sup> This fragment has been published by J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 94. Cf. line 2 of this fragment.

<sup>2</sup> Lines 3 f.

<sup>3</sup> In another fragment, published by Allegro, *ibid.* pp. 94 f. Cf. lines 3 f.

<sup>4</sup> Line 5.

<sup>5</sup> Published by J. M. Allegro, *P.E.Q.* lxxxvi (1954), 69 ff. Cf. col. II, line 15: "the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness".

those who were associated with them. Since it is certain, as I have already said, that the Teacher of Righteousness lived before the beginning of the Christian era, the choice of possible times is limited, and we may examine in turn the three principal views which have been put forward. Of the views which place the Teacher of Righteousness in post-Christian times nothing will be said here, since they seem to be definitely excluded by the evidence which is now available. At an earlier stage in the discussion of the Scrolls it was right for any hypothesis to be advanced which appeared consistent with what was then known, and the scholars who advanced views which are today seen to be untenable in the light of what we now know rendered a real service in guarding against the too ready acceptance of views without critical examination. The fact that the archaeological evidence now available puts some of these views definitely out of court is no reflection on the scholars who propounded them; on the other hand there is little point in examining them here, since the *terminus ante quem* for the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves is A.D. 68, and the period of the Teacher of Righteousness must be at least a century earlier.

Professor Dupont-Sommer has argued for the view that the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the middle of the first century B.C.<sup>1</sup> As he is the most powerful of the advocates for this view, it may suffice to examine his arguments. The Wicked Priest is identified with Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II.<sup>2</sup> Here it is fair to remember that some passages refer to the "last priests of Jerusalem". It is, nevertheless, a little surprising if the term "the Wicked Priest" is used alternately of two different people. The passages referring to the punishment suffered by the Wicked Priest are interpreted of Aristobulus,<sup>3</sup> who died in prison of poison at the hands of Pompey's supporters.<sup>4</sup>

On this view the Teacher of Righteousness is held to have been martyred about 65-63 B.C.<sup>5</sup> In the latter year Pompey

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Observations sur le "Commentaire d'Habacuc" découvert près de la Mer Morte* (1950); *Aperçus préliminaires* (1950); *Nouveaux aperçus* (1953); and many articles. Cf. also K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (1953).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 52 (Eng. trans., p. 40).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 46 f. (Eng. trans., p. 36 f.).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv, vii. 4 (xiv. 124).

<sup>5</sup> Dupont-Sommer earlier gave the date as between 67 and 63 B.C. Cf.

captured Jerusalem, and Dupont-Sommer interprets the obscure passage in the Habakkuk Commentary,<sup>1</sup> to which reference has already been made, to say that the martyred Teacher reappeared in the Temple on the Day of Atonement, when the city was captured.<sup>2</sup> The interpretation is very hazardous, and few other scholars can be found to accept this view of the passage.<sup>3</sup> They find no reference to any reappearance of the Teacher, or to the capture of the city. By most it is believed that the text refers to the Wicked Priest's appearance in the Temple. Moreover, it is much disputed whether Pompey captured the city on the Day of Atonement, and those who have examined this question stand firmly against Dupont-Sommer.<sup>4</sup>

According to this theory the Kittim are to be identified with the Romans in the Habakkuk Commentary. But, be it observed, the Romans were not in Palestine during the ministry of the Teacher of Righteousness on this view. Nor is there the slightest evidence that Pompey harassed the religious enemies of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus.<sup>5</sup> Although Pompey entered the Temple, our ancient authorities state specifically that he did not touch the Temple treasures.<sup>6</sup> To the identification of the Kittim with the Romans we shall have to return. Here we may observe that Dupont-Sommer identified the Kittim of the Battle Scroll with the Seleucids and the Ptolemies.<sup>7</sup> He held that the sect

*Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 47 (Eng. trans., p. 35). More recently he has modified it slightly to "vers 65-63". Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Col. XI, lines 4 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 27 f.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 153 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, xli (1950-51), 151 ff.; S. Zeitlin, *ibid.* pp. 153, 264; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle*, (April 1951), pp. 64 f.; M. B. Dagut, *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 542 ff.; D. L. Drew, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, xiii, (May 1951), 93 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Josephus records that 12,000 Jews were slain in the attack on Jerusalem, and that most of these were priests, the majority of them being slain by the opposite faction of the Jews (cf. *B.J.* i, vii. 5 (i. 150 f.), *Antiq.* xiv, iv. 4 (xiv. 69 f.)), but there is no reason to connect any of them with the sect of the Scrolls, who on Dupont-Sommer's hypothesis did not belong to the faction of either Aristobulus or Hyrcanus.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv, iv. 4 (xiv. 72), *B.J.* i, vii. 6 (i. 152 f.); Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxviii. 67.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 98 (Eng. trans., pp. 79 f.).

came into existence in the Maccabaeon period, and that the Battle Scroll reflected the situation of that time.<sup>1</sup> This was because of the references to the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim in Egypt, who marched against the kings of the north. We are familiar with the expression 'the king of the north' in the book of Daniel to signify the Seleucid king of Syria.<sup>2</sup> More recently, however, Dupont-Sommer has withdrawn this identification.<sup>3</sup> When one of his critics objected that it was preferable to give the same interpretation to the term Kittim in the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk Commentary, Dupont-Sommer rejected the objection as without weight.<sup>4</sup> But when Dr. Yadin suggested that the Kittim of the Battle Scroll might also be the Romans,<sup>5</sup> Dupont-Sommer pointed out that this made it possible to give the same interpretation to the term in the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk Commentary, and that it would be an advantage to have a common interpretation.<sup>6</sup> It may be said at once that if a common interpretation is given it cannot be the Roman. For in the Battle Scroll there is mention of the king of the Kittim.<sup>7</sup> There was no king of the Romans in Republican times, and even in imperial times the Caesars did not use the term king. It is curious to note that Dupont-Sommer argued that the Kittim of the Habakkuk Commentary could not be the Greeks, but must be the Romans, since their rulers are not called kings there,<sup>8</sup> but must be the Roman military commanders, who arose one after the other,<sup>9</sup> yet now wishes to say that the Kittim of the Battle Scroll could be the Romans, though their head is here given the impossible title of king.

If the sect came into existence in the Maccabaeon period, we are faced with the statement of the Zadokite Work that after

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 112 (Eng. trans., p. 91).

<sup>2</sup> Dan. xi.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *R.H.R.* cxlviii (1955), 42 f.; *Evidences*, No. 62 (January-February 1957), pp. 33 f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. I. Rabinowitz, *V.T.* iii (1953), 181 and Dupont-Sommer, *Semítica* v, (1955), 53.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Ha-aretz*, 23 July, 1955, cited by Dupont-Sommer, *R.H.R.*, loc. cit. (I have not had access to this article.)

<sup>6</sup> *R.H.R.* loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup> Col. XV, line 2.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., p. 19).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 41 n. (Eng. trans., p. 30 n.); *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 18 f.).



twenty years of groping the Teacher of Righteousness arose to lead the sect. To place his martyrdom about a century later than this would be to credit him with an unduly long ministry. Dupont-Sommer has now moved from this position, however, and holds that the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, which came to an end *circa* 65-63 B.C., had lasted for about forty years.<sup>1</sup> If the twenty years of groping, which preceded the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, is allowed for, the sect would have had its first beginning about 130 B.C. Yet Dupont-Sommer accepts the statement of Josephus,<sup>2</sup> that already in 146 B.C. the sect of the Essenes was in existence.<sup>3</sup> The archaeological evidence suggests that the Qumran centre was established during the reign of John Hyrcanus,<sup>4</sup> and Dupont-Sommer appears to accept this view.<sup>5</sup> In that case it must have been established at the very beginning of the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, if not already before. It is highly improbable that during the period of groping in darkness, the sect was organized in the Qumran centre, and, as I shall show in a subsequent paper, it is unlikely that one of the first things the Teacher of Righteousness did was to found this centre.

Professor Goossens came to the support of Dupont-Sommer with the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness was Onias the Rain-bringer.<sup>6</sup> In later Jewish sources this Onias is credited with the power to work miracles, but we have no evidence that he was the organizer of a sect. When Hyrcanus and Aristobulus were fighting one another, Onias was brought to the camp of Hyrcanus, and because he was unwilling to curse those on the other side, he was done to death by the soldiers of Hyrcanus.<sup>7</sup> If these were really the circumstances of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, it is hard to see why the punishment for the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Antiq.* XIII. v. 9 (xiii. 171).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Evidences*, No. 56 (April 1956), p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 566, 569; M. Burrows, *op. cit.* p. 65.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59, August-September (1956), p. 16; also *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, Eng. trans. by R. D. Barnett, p. 169.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 336 ff.; *Académie Royale de Belge: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 5th ser. xxxvi (1950), 440 ff. This view was approved by Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 47 n. (Eng. trans., p. 36 n.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv, ii. 1 (xiv. 22 ff.).

crime of Hyrcanus should fall on his enemy Aristobulus. Of the miracles with which Onias was credited none is referred to in any of the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is little point of contact between what we learn of the Teacher of Righteousness from the literature of the Qumran sect and what is recorded of this Onias in rabbinical sources. Dupont-Sommer links the reference to the House of Absalom with Absalom, the uncle of Aristobulus ;<sup>1</sup> but we are offered no reason why he should be blamed for not coming to the help of the Teacher of Righteousness.

It will be clear that the reasons for assigning the death of the Teacher of Righteousness to the time just before Pompey's capture of Jerusalem are of the slightest, and more is left without explanation than is explained. The strongest part of Dupont-Sommer's argument, however, lies in his identification of the Kittim with the Romans. That identification I have recently examined elsewhere, and I can only summarize the evidence here.<sup>2</sup>

It is beyond dispute that of itself the term Kittim could mean either the Romans or the Greeks.<sup>3</sup> In Daniel it certainly means the Romans ;<sup>4</sup> in 1 Maccabees it equally certainly means the Greeks.<sup>5</sup> Much of what we are told in the Qumran texts would be true enough of either. Decisive importance is attached by Dupont-Sommer to the statement of the Habakkuk Commentary that the Kittim sacrificed to their " signs " and worshipped their arms.<sup>6</sup> This is held to refer to the Roman cult of standards. For Roman sacrifice to standards we have the single witness of Josephus,<sup>7</sup> who says that in A.D. 70, after the destruction of the Temple, the Roman soldiers sacrificed to their standards. For any evidence of such sacrifice in Republican times no evidence whatever is forthcoming, and H. J. Rose, writing without any axe to grind on the Scrolls and before their discovery, stated this quite explicitly.<sup>8</sup> Dupont-Sommer is insistent that those who

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 48 (Eng. trans., p. 37).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *P.E.Q.* lxxxviii (1956), 92 ff.

<sup>3</sup> In this Dupont-Sommer and I are in full agreement. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 34 f. Eng. trans., pp. 15 f.) and *B.J.R.L.* xxxv (1952-3), 133.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. xi. 30.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Macc. i. 1, viii. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Habakkuk Commentary, col. VI, lines 4 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *B.J.* vi, vi. 1 (vi. 316).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949), p. 857 b.

disagree with him must produce evidence not alone of the veneration of standards, but of sacrifice to them by the people with whom the Kittim are identified.<sup>1</sup> Yet on his side he is not able to provide such evidence.<sup>2</sup> It is undoubted that standards were sacred in Republican Rome, as amongst other peoples, but it is not legitimate to antedate by more than a century our evidence for sacrifice to Roman standards.

On the other hand, it is known that sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms prevailed in the East in ancient times and that it continued in Syria in post-Christian times.<sup>3</sup> It is more probable that a practice which is known to have prevailed in the lands ruled by the Seleucids before and after Seleucid times prevailed also under their rule than to suppose that it had died out and was reintroduced from Rome—the more so, as Classical scholars, writing before the discovery of the Scrolls and with no axe to grind here, have held that it was borrowed by Rome from the East.<sup>4</sup> When we have evidence of the sacrifice to standards amongst the Romans, it is associated with Ruler worship,<sup>5</sup> and Ruler Worship was not practised in Republican Rome, but was practised under the Seleucids.<sup>6</sup> While, then, there is no direct evidence for sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms either in the time of Pompey or under the Seleucids, there is far greater probability in the case of the latter than in the case of the former, and the cast-iron case which Dupont-Sommer has claimed for the Roman identification of the Kittim on this ground does not survive examination.

We may now add that the Nahum Commentary carries us back quite certainly to the period before Pompey for the Wicked Priest. The reference to the attempt by Demetrius to enter

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *V.T.* v (1955), 115 f. n., and *Semitica*, v (1955), 54.

<sup>2</sup> For the examination of such claims made since the discovery of the Scrolls cf. *P.E.Q.* lxxxviii (1956), 100 ff. These claims, even if allowed, would not establish the practice of *sacrifice* to standards in Republican times, but only of veneration, which Dupont-Sommer recognizes to be insufficient.

<sup>3</sup> On this cf. my paper in *P.E.Q.*, loc. cit. pp. 102 ff. <sup>4</sup> Cf. *ibid.* p. 104.

<sup>5</sup> The emperor's effigy was on the standards sacrificed to in Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii, iii. 1 (xviii. 55).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. E. E. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, ii (1902), 154 n., 156 ff. For other references to discussions of Ruler Worship in the Hellenistic Kingdoms, cf. *P.E.Q.*, loc. cit. p. 102 n.

Jerusalem brings us at the latest to the time of Demetrius III. The following line mentions the period from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim. The Antiochus is thought to be Antiochus Epiphanes,<sup>1</sup> and if so it is improbable that this sentence covers a period from about a century before the time of Demetrius III down to the Roman appearance in Palestine after his reign. To this, however, we shall return. Here it will suffice to note that this is the latest period to which this text can refer. The Teacher of Righteousness is not referred to in this commentary, which mentions, it will be remembered, the crucifixions by the Young Lion of Wrath. It is improbable that this text deals with events before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness,<sup>2</sup> and therefore likely that it deals with things that happened either during his leadership of the sect, or after his death. While there is a gap in the text, it seems probable that it stated that the wealth of the priests of Jerusalem should be the prey of the Young Lion of Wrath.<sup>3</sup> This is against the view that the Young Lion is to be identified with the Wicked Priest, but favours the view that he was contemporary with him.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore probable that a conflict, in which members of the sect were

<sup>1</sup> So J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 93.

<sup>2</sup> C. Rabin, *J.J.S.* vii (1956), 11, suggests that this text deals with events of the distant past, before the time of the Teacher of Righteousness, on the ground that historical personal names are used and not cryptic names. As he follows Allegro in identifying the Young Lion of Wrath with Jannaeus, he suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness must be placed in a later age. The fact that the Qumran centre almost certainly dates from the end of the second century B.C. is against this view, since it is unlikely that the sect was organized in Qumran so long before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, when we learn from its own literature that its first gropings in darkness began twenty years before his rise.

<sup>3</sup> Line 11.

<sup>4</sup> A further consideration against the identification of the Young Lion of Wrath with the Wicked Priest is that the whole book of Nahum is directed against the Assyrians, and the section commented on here deals with Nineveh. The sect could easily transfer to the Kittim what is said of the Assyrians, just as in the Habakkuk Commentary they transfer to the Kittim what is said of the Chaldaean. It is not so likely that the Wicked Priest would be equated with the Assyrians. In the Habakkuk Commentary the righteous man becomes the Teacher of Righteousness and the wicked man the Wicked Priest, but wherever the context is unequivocally Chaldaean the interpretation turns to the foreign Kittim. This consideration therefore favours the probability that the Young Lion of Wrath is a foreign enemy.



involved, took place before the time of Pompey, during the reign of a Demetrius, and since there is a reference to crucifixions, it is likely that members of the sect and their sympathizers were amongst the crucified.<sup>1</sup> There is no reason to suppose that a second crisis for the sect, in many ways similar to the first, arose again under Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Moreover, if the Kittim were the Greeks, as I have argued, the conditions reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary were certainly not those of the period immediately before Pompey's arrival in Jerusalem.

We may turn then to the second view, which makes Alexander Jannaeus the Wicked Priest. This Jewish king reigned in the first quarter of the first century B.C. Here it may be said at once that while on this view no known person can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, some of the things we are told about the Wicked Priest would excellently fit Jannaeus. The reference to crucifixions in the Nahum Commentary has recalled<sup>2</sup> the crucifixion of 800 of his enemies by Jannaeus,<sup>3</sup> and the obscure reference to something that happened on the Day of Atonement, which Dupont-Sommer improbably connected with the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, has been held<sup>4</sup> to refer to the massacre of 6,000 persons by Jannaeus, which, according to Josephus,<sup>5</sup> took place at the Feast of Tabernacles. The Wicked Priest is said to have profaned the sanctuary,<sup>6</sup> and we know that Jannaeus aroused much opposition by his exercise of the priestly office when many thought he should not, and he was pelted by the mob with citrons.<sup>7</sup>

The advocates of this period for the Wicked Priest, and therefore for the Teacher of Righteousness, are not agreed,

<sup>1</sup> J. M. Allegro in a letter to *The Times* (20 March 1956), rightly says that the mention of the crucifixions in this text implies that these had some particular relevance for the history of the sect, though he holds in his article in *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 89 ff., that they were crucifixions of people unconnected with the sect, and with whom the members of the sect had no sympathy. This seems quite unnatural, and it is more reasonable to suppose that the relevance for the sect lay in the fact that their own members and sympathizers were amongst the crucified.

<sup>2</sup> So J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Antiq.* XIII, xiv. 2 (xiii. 380), *B.J.* I. iv. 6 (i. 97).

<sup>4</sup> So M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), pp. 65 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5 (xiii. 372).

<sup>6</sup> Habakkuk Commentary, col. XII, lines 8 f. <sup>7</sup> *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5 (xiii. 372).

however, on certain fundamental issues. On the one hand the Kittim are identified with the Seleucids and the sect associated with the Pharisees,<sup>1</sup> or, on the other hand, the Kittim are identified with the Romans and the sect differentiated from the Pharisees and linked with the Essenes.<sup>2</sup> It is necessary, then, to look at the difficulties encountered by each of these views. But first we must look at the internal and external relations of Jannaeus. He was bitterly opposed by the Pharisees, and at one point in his reign these enemies of his invited the help of the Seleucid monarch, Demetrius III, against him.<sup>3</sup> Demetrius marched against Jannaeus, who suffered a defeat; whereupon some of his Jewish foes repented of their action and went over to the king, and Demetrius, finding his support melting away, withdrew to the north. Jannaeus then seized 800 of his foes and crucified them with a callousness that rivalled Nero's later treatment of the early Christians.<sup>4</sup>

If the Kittim were the Seleucids and the sect the Pharisees, the conditions reflected in the Scrolls would be far from met. For the Seleucids acted against Jannaeus, and therefore, on this view, against the Wicked Priest. Their allies were the Pharisees, and therefore, on this view, the members of the sect. Yet in the Nahum Commentary Demetrius is said to have sought to enter Jerusalem with the help of the seekers after smooth things. It is not likely that this description was intended to refer to members of the sect. The condemnation of the Wicked Priest and of the Kittim in the Habakkuk Commentary is much more naturally understood if the Kittim and the Priest were associated in their hostility to the sect than if they stood opposed to one another, and it is wholly improbable that the sect entered into any alliance with the Kittim. In the Battle Scroll the Kittim figure amongst the foreign foes of the sect, to be overthrown as the first of the foreign powers to be successively conquered. While we must beware of assuming that the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk

<sup>1</sup> So Delcor, *op. cit.* pp. 56 ff.

<sup>2</sup> So J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956); also F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5, xiv. 1 f. (xiii. 376 ff.), *B.J.* I, iv. 4 ff. (i. 92 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII, xiv. 2 (xiii. 380), *B.J.* I, iv. 6 (i. 97).

Commentary reflect the same period, it must be recognized that in both the Kittim incur the same fierce hatred.

On the other hand, against the theory that the Wicked Priest was Jannaeus and the Kittim the Romans, while the sect is to be identified with the Essenes, it must be observed that we have no evidence whatever of either the Romans or Jannaeus persecuting the Essenes in that age. It is hard to suppose that the references to the bitter cruelty of the Kittim were merely based on reports coming from abroad. On the other hand, if the composition of the texts is placed after the coming of the Romans into Palestine, when their authors might have had some experience of them at close quarters, it could hardly have been thought that Jannaeus, the supposed Wicked Priest, would be delivered into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles, since by that time history would have demonstrated otherwise. It has been suggested that Jannaeus was the Young Lion of Wrath who hung men alive,<sup>1</sup> and that while this is a reference to his crucifixion of 800 of his foes, no mention would have been made of this in the Nahum Commentary if he had not also crucified the Teacher of Righteousness, who is nowhere mentioned in the commentary.<sup>2</sup> This is wholly without cogency. For surely if the Teacher of Righteousness had been crucified this would have merited direct mention, and not have been left to be inferred from the mention of the crucifixion of people with whom he was in no way associated. It seems to me legitimate to suppose that the mention of the hanging men alive by the Young Lion of Wrath involved members of the sect and their sympathizers, and therefore that it was not an allusion to the crucifixion of Pharisees. It is similarly legitimate to suppose that the cruel persecution of men by the Kittim would not have been mentioned if the sect had not suffered at their hands, and this means that we are definitely not in the days of Jannaeus with the Romans as the Kittim. In any case there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Alexander Jannaeus or by anyone else. There is not the faintest allusion to his crucifixion, either in the Nahum Commentary or in any other text.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 92.      <sup>2</sup> Cf. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 98 f., and letter to *The Times* (20 March 1956).

Yet another form of the Jannaeus view is that the sect was associated with the Pharisees and Sadducees in opposition to Jannaeus, though at the same time opposed to them on other issues.<sup>1</sup> Here the Kittim are once more identified with the Romans, and the difficulties of this view for the period of Jannaeus have been sufficiently indicated. There is no reason arising from the text of the Scrolls to suggest that the members of the sect had anything to do with the seekers after smooth things who invoked foreign aid against Jannaeus, and their hostility to the Wicked Priest, to the seekers after smooth things who were on the side of Demetrius, and to the Kittim is uniformly expressed in all the texts where they are mentioned.

Millar Burrows has observed that "the very existence of so many different theories connected with Alexander Jannaeus should arouse suspicion as to the validity of any association between him and the Habakkuk Commentary".<sup>2</sup> The fundamental difficulty under which this view in all its forms labours is that the Kittim can be equated with neither the Seleucids nor the Romans in any satisfactory way. The Kittim of the Battle Scroll, who had a king, could not be the Romans, and no ingenuity can get round this difficulty. Yet it is equally impossible to equate them with the Seleucids in the first century B.C. For to the author of the Battle Scroll the Kittim were the most hated of foes, and so if he represented the sect by composing this work in that age, the members of the sect should have been solidly behind Jannaeus in his war with Demetrius. Yet it is impossible to think of them rallying behind the Wicked Priest. The age of Jannaeus does not provide the setting for the dream of a Holy War against either Seleucids or Romans. To transfer the composition of the work to the end of the first century B.C., after the Romans had appeared on the scene, does not ease the situation. For the Seleucids had then disappeared, and the Romans still had no king.

An equally fundamental difficulty, which is important against both the Jannaeus theory and the Aristobulus-Hyrcaus II theory, is that the situation does not explain the particular ideas and teachings of the sect. It would be easy to see how a sect

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Segal, loc. cit. p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 177.



which attached great importance to the Zadokite priesthood should oppose the Hasmonaeon assumption of that priesthood. It is not easy to see why a sect should arise in the time of Hyrcanus I or Jannaeus on this issue, so many decades after the Hasmonaeans had assumed the priesthood.

Moreover, there is no evidence that Jannaeus or Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II promoted idolatry or profaned the Temple, whereas the sect condemned those who did these things. The sect attached great importance to the keeping of the sabbath, but there is no reason to suppose that this was a special current issue in the first century. The sect attached much importance to the correct calendar, but again this was no new or flaming issue in the first century, so far as we know. All of these things had been living issues in the second century, and any group which had once taken a stand on them might be expected to continue to do so; but a sect which came into existence at the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century entirely on issues which had been burning issues half a century or more earlier, but which were no longer burning issues, would be one which came belatedly into existence. What it is incumbent on the advocates for the Jannaeus view or the Aristobulus-Hyrcanus II view to show is why the sect came into existence at the precise point when they assume it came into being, and how its teaching and practice can be related to the particular situation of that time.

We may therefore turn to the third of the views I mentioned at the beginning, that the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest belonged to the second century B.C., and to the critical period of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes which provoked the Maccabaeon rising. For this view I argued some years ago,<sup>1</sup> and all the additional information we now have seems to accord with it.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 61 ff.; *B.J.R.L.* xxxv (1952-53), 137 ff.; *E.Th.L.* xxviii (1952), 269 ff. This view has been held by a number of other scholars including Bo Reicke, *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 45 ff. (though abandoned in *Handskrifterna från Qumran* (1952)), J. Trinquet, *V.T.* i (1951), 287 ff., E. Dhorme, *C.R.A.I.* (1951), pp. 199 f., E. Stauffer, *Th.L.Z.* lxxvi (1951), 667 ff., G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxiv (1952), 259 ff., I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxi (1952), 19 ff. and *V.T.* iii (1953), 175 ff., H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (1952), pp. 143 ff., A. Michel, *Le Maître de Justice* (1954), J. C. G. Greig, *N.T.S.* ii (1955), 119 ff. In *Z.R.G.G.* viii (1956), 250 ff., E.

Of this period we have considerable knowledge. Palestine had recently been transferred from the control of the Ptolemies to that of the Seleucids, who are called the kings of the north in the book of Daniel.<sup>1</sup> There was growing tension between the stricter parties of the Jews and their Seleucid masters, and at the same time there were hellenizing Jews, including members of the priesthood, who were on the side of the Seleucids against the orthodox Jews, and against Onias, the High Priest.<sup>2</sup> These could well be called the seekers after smooth things. Onias was expelled from the High Priesthood, and replaced first by his brother Jason, and then by Menelaus, who was not even of the legitimate high priestly line.<sup>3</sup> The followers and supporters of Onias might naturally call themselves the Zadokites, or supporters of the true line of Zadok. Onias was ultimately killed by the Seleucid king as the result of the intrigue of Menelaus, who is a suitable candidate for the title of Wicked Priest.<sup>4</sup> The rapacity of Menelaus is attested in our ancient sources,<sup>5</sup> and the prediction

Stauffer presents the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be identified with Jose ben Joezer of Zeredah, of the Maccabean period.

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. i. 11 ff., 2 Macc. iii. 1 ff., iv. 1 ff.

<sup>3</sup> He was first succeeded by his brother Jason (2 Macc. iv. 7), and then by Menelaus (2 Macc. iv. 23 f.). Josephus says that Menelaus was also the brother of Onias (*Antiq.* xii, v. 1 (xii. 238)). Some writers have preferred this account. For a discussion of the question, cf. my paper in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata* (1953), pp. 303 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 32 ff. The statement in the Habakkuk Commentary that he was "named according to the truth" when he first took office has been held to be a difficulty against this view, and it has been held to favour the Jannaeus view, since Jannaeus is said by Josephus to have been superior in age and character to his brothers before he attained the throne (*B.J.* i, iv. 1 (i. 85)). This would not be naturally expressed by saying that he was "named according to the truth". On the other hand Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*, p. 64, when arguing for the identification with Alexander Jannaeus, holds the reference to be to his Jewish name of Jonathan. Cf. also M. Burrows, *op. cit.* p. 175. If the reference is to the personal name of the King—and this would seem to be a natural understanding of the expression—this explanation would apply to Menelaus, who probably affected the Greek name of Menelaus, just as Jason affected a Greek name. Josephus says that the real name of Menelaus was Onias, and this may well be true, though the statement of Josephus that he was the brother of the other Onias is probably wrong. For two brothers to be named Onias would be surprising, but if Menelaus was not the brother of the High Priest Onias, there would be no difficulty about his bearing the same name.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 24, 27.

that the wealth of the priests would be handed over to the Kittim found its fulfilment in the plunder of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, who robbed the Temple of no less than 1,800 talents.<sup>1</sup> While, therefore, in that age the Seleucids and the priests were allied against the stricter Jews, there was no security for the priests against their foreign masters. Moreover, Menelaus came to an evil end at the hands of those masters,<sup>2</sup> as the Scrolls predict that the Wicked Priest would suffer at the hands of the aliens.

The Kittim would be the Greeks on this view. I have already said that the term could in itself stand for either Greeks or Romans, but that the reference to the king of the Kittim in the Battle Scroll shows that it cannot mean the Romans there. In the period of which we are thinking, the Greeks were to be found in Egypt, in the Ptolemaic kingdom, and in Syria, in the Seleucid kingdom. It would then be natural for the sect to dream of victory first over the Kittim of Assyria, i.e. Syria, and then over those in Egypt. The Battle Scroll indicates that the Philistines, Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites were allied to the Kittim of Assyria, and it is not without significance to note that when Judas the Maccabee led the Jews against the Seleucids, he immediately turned to attack the Philistines, the Edomites, and the region east of the Jordan—i.e. the territory of the Moabites and Ammonites.<sup>3</sup>

An objection to the view I am now presenting has been raised on the ground that the Kittim are said to have come from the isles or coastlands, and that while this would be relevant to the Romans it would not be relevant to the Seleucids.<sup>4</sup> But Josephus records that the army of Antiochus Epiphanes included mercenaries from the islands,<sup>5</sup> while in 1 Maccabees we learn that in the year following the death of Antiochus an army was collected for Antiochus Eupator, in which were men from other kingdoms and from the isles of the sea,<sup>6</sup> while shortly after Demetrius I raised an army against the Jews from the isles of the Gentiles.<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. i. 20 ff., 2 Macc. v. 15 f., 21, also Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. v. 4 (xii. 249 ff.), and *Contra Ap.* ii. 7 (83 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> 2 Macc. xiii. 3 ff.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Macc. v. 3 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 41 (Eng. trans., p. 29) and *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 35 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 16 f.); C. Detaye, *E.Th.L.* xxx (1954), 324. <sup>5</sup> Cf. *Antiq.* xii. xii. 2 (xii. 293). <sup>6</sup> 1 Macc. vi. 28.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Macc. xi. 38. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. iv. 9 (xiii. 129).

objection therefore falls completely to the ground. Similarly, as I have already said, the reference to sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms fits the Seleucids better than it does Republican Rome.

In the period of which we are thinking, Antiochus Epiphanes bitterly persecuted the loyal Jews, with the backing of his hellenizing Jewish supporters. He proscribed the practices of Judaism, and death was the penalty for possessing copies of its sacred books.<sup>1</sup> Circumcision was forbidden, and those who circumcised their children were crucified, with their babes hung around their necks.<sup>2</sup> This provides a far more suitable background for the references to the cruelty of the Kittim, even to the fruit of the womb, and to the crucifixions by the Young Lion of Wrath than the other view I have mentioned. For instead of hearsay evidence about the Kittim from abroad and the execution of rebels, with whom the sect is believed to have had no connection, we have here the crucifixion of members of the sect and their sympathizers for their loyalty to the principles of their faith. These are martyrs for their faith, as the executed Pharisees were not. The Young Lion of Wrath would be Antiochus Epiphanes, or—less probably—one of his agents.

Again, the only contemporary persons who have their known personal names in the Scrolls are Antiochus and Demetrius. So far as I know, no one has suggested identifying the former with anyone but Antiochus Epiphanes. It would be more natural for him to be named here if he were the great antagonist of the sect and its Teacher than if he had lived almost a century earlier. The Demetrius who is mentioned in the next line is more likely to have been Demetrius I, who was already on the throne within two years of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, than Demetrius III in the following century. For Demetrius I certainly sought to get possession of Jerusalem with the help of the seekers after smooth things, and the boastful threat of his general, Nicanor, against the Temple, with its sequel in his defeat and death and the nailing of his arm to the wall by Judas, need not be enlarged upon.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1 Macc. i. 56 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xii, v. 4 (xii. 256).

<sup>3</sup> 1 Macc. vii. 26 ff.



The House of Absalom would, on this view, be the Tobiad family, which, though akin to the High Priest, put its own interests above the ties of kinship, and gave Onias no support against his enemies, with whom they were in league.<sup>1</sup> Such conduct would well deserve the opprobrious designation as the house of Absalom, recalling Absalom's treachery against his own father. Moreover, the sect condemned marriage with a niece.<sup>2</sup> This is not specifically forbidden in the Law, but the sect, like the later Karaites, extended by analogy the Law's prohibition of the marriage of a woman and her nephew to the marriage of a man with his niece. Some later Pharisees commended such a marriage.<sup>3</sup> Josephus records the marriage of the head of the Tobiad house with his niece, under circumstances which were anything but creditable to him.<sup>4</sup> If the Tobiad house were the house of Absalom, we could well understand how our sect would seize on this discreditable incident in the recent history of the family and would condemn it with the utmost strength.<sup>5</sup>

We may next observe that many of the special teachings of the sect can be understood in terms of the situation of this period. Their condemnation of idolatry<sup>6</sup> and the reference to the polluting of the sanctuary<sup>7</sup> have no particular relevance in the time of Alexander Jannaeus or in that of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. But in the days when Antiochus profaned the Temple, and set up a heathen altar within the sacred precincts,<sup>8</sup> this would be a very living issue. The strong insistence on the keeping of the Sabbath would equally be explained.<sup>9</sup> For we know that in the Maccabaeen period some of the devotees of the Law allowed themselves to be slaughtered on the Sabbath day without resistance.<sup>10</sup> Since Judas laid it down that his followers were to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden* (1899).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Zadokite Work, vii. 9 f. (p. v, lines 7 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. S. Krauss, in *Studies in Jewish Literature* (Kaufmann Kohler Festschrift) (1913), p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Antiq.* xii, iv. 6 (xii. 186 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Bo Reicke first drew attention to this. Cf. *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 55.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Zadokite Work ix. 34 (p. xx, line 9) and Manual of Discipline, col. II, lines 11, 17.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Zadokite Work, ix. 47 (p. xx, line 24).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. i. 54 ff. For the complicity of Menelaus in the profaning of the sanctuary, cf. 2 Macc. iv. 39, v. 15 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Zadokite Work, v. 1 f. (p. iii, lines 12 ff.), viii. 15 (p. xi, lines 4 ff.).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. ii. 32 ff.

defend themselves on the Sabbath day, it is clear that this issue must have been discussed. Again, we know that the sect was interested in questions of the calendar,<sup>1</sup> and once more this was a live issue in the time of which we are thinking. The book of Daniel tells us that the Little Horn, or Antiochus Epiphanes, sought to change times,<sup>2</sup> and the book of Jubilees, which may be dated with great probability in the middle of the second century B.C., shows that calendar issues were living issues at that time.<sup>3</sup> The calendar favoured by the sect appears to have been the same as that favoured by the author of the book of Jubilees.<sup>4</sup>

The death of the Teacher of Righteousness was clearly regarded by the sect as marking a turning point of time, since its members believed that forty years after his death all the men of war who were ranged against them should be destroyed.<sup>5</sup> It is likely that the War against the Sons of Darkness was thought of as lasting for forty years, and probably the same period was in mind. In the book of Daniel we find a reference to the cutting off of an Anointed One,<sup>6</sup> and this has commonly been interpreted in terms of the death of Onias, the rightful High Priest. Great significance is attached to this death in the book of Daniel, which made it one of the critical points in the schematic period of seventy weeks of years which should precede the establishment of the great enduring kingdom. If the Teacher of Righteousness is rightly to be identified with Onias, the widespread significance attached to his death finds confirmation here. It is true that the basis of calculation is different in the book of Daniel and in the Zadokite Work, but one has only to study the apocalyptic works

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Zadokite Work, v. 1 f. (p. iii, lines 12 ff.), viii. 15 (p. vi, lines 18 f.), xx. 1 (p. xvi, lines 2 f.), and Manual of Discipline, col. I, lines 14 f.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jubilees vi. 17 ff., xvi. 20 ff., xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 18 ff., xlix. 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Jaubert, *V.T.* iii (1953), 250 ff., vii (1957), 35 ff.; also J. Morgenstern, *V.T.* v (1955), 34 ff., and J. Obermann, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 285 ff.

<sup>5</sup> In Zadokite Work, ix. 29 B (pp. xix, line 35, xx, line 1) the period from the death of the Teacher to the coming of the Messiah is mentioned, but without specifying its duration. In ix. 39 B (p. xx, lines 13 ff.) the period from the death of the Teacher to the destruction of all the men of war who were with the Man of the Lie is specified as forty years. It is probable that both the references are to the same period and that the coming of the Messiah was expected to signalize the destruction of all the enemies of the sect.

<sup>6</sup> Dan. ix. 26.

of the last two centuries before the Christian era and of the early Christian centuries to realize how the basis of calculation was being continually varied to accommodate it to an ever changing situation.

The chronology of the sect also falls into line on this view. If the twenty years of groping is put before the rise of Onias, and he is identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, then the migration of the sect to Damascus would fall within the forty years following his death in 171 B.C.<sup>1</sup> There are some who think that Qumran is meant by Damascus.<sup>2</sup> I am not persuaded that this is so, though it is certain that if the sect did withdraw to Damascus they returned later, and perhaps after a very short stay, and settled in the wilderness of Judaea at Qumran, where fragments of the Zadokite Work have been found. The difference between this view and the view that Qumran is Damascus is not of serious chronological significance therefore. If the migration to Damascus fell a little before 131 B.C., and the return a few years later, we should be very near to the date assigned to the building of the Qumran centre by the archaeologists. The earliest coins found at Qumran date from the reign of John Hyrcanus, 134-104 B.C. While the earliest coins might have been minted either shortly before, or shortly after, the establishment of the centre, it is not without significance that we are very close to the date to which we should be brought on my view.<sup>3</sup>

There is nothing in the Scrolls to indicate that the Teacher of Righteousness was ever in Qumran. The migration to Damascus was under the leadership of one who is called the Star, who appears to have been a different person from the Teacher of Righteousness. Since he was an organizer, he cannot have preceded the Teacher of Righteousness since the sect groped in darkness until the latter's rise. He is therefore likely to have

<sup>1</sup> Since the Zadokite Work was clearly written within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, but already looks back on the migration.

<sup>2</sup> So R. North, *P.E.Q.* lxxxv (1955), 34 ff.; cf. also I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxiii (1954), 11ff.

<sup>3</sup> It has been noted above that the view of de Vaux is that the centre was founded either during the reign of Hyrcanus I or during that of Jannaeus.

been a later organizer.<sup>1</sup> This accords with the view I have presented, but gives rise to difficulties on the other views, which place the Teacher of Righteousness in the first century B.C. For then the founding of the Qumran centre must be placed long before the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, and therefore either during the period of his leadership or before. To suppose that it was before his time is very difficult, since it was but groping in darkness then. To suppose that it was under his leadership that the sect had withdrawn from Jerusalem to the desert decades before his persecution and death yields a less natural course of development than the one I have outlined. During the time of the Teacher of Righteousness whose leadership of the sect may have been of short duration, there was bitter conflict within the nation and without, in which the Teacher and the members of the sect were involved. Within a decade or two of the Teacher's death the members withdrew from the conflict to Damascus and a life of contemplation. All that we know of the organization of the sect, whether from the Zadokite Work or the Manual of Discipline or the first century A.D. accounts of the Essenes accords with this. If Damascus is other than Qumran, then the return from Damascus to Qumran would leave the sect still withdrawn from the bitter conflict with their fellow Jews, living a life of contemplation and study, while cherishing their faith and their hope of triumph in the future. If the fight against the Wicked Priest had been carried on from organized headquarters in Qumran, we should have expected not only the Teacher of Righteousness to be persecuted and martyred, but the headquarters to be destroyed. This is precisely what happened in A.D. 68. Then the sect appears to have been allied with the Zealots who fought the Romans, and in consequence the Qumran centre was destroyed. But if the withdrawal to Damascus and the subsequent founding of the Qumran centre marked the withdrawal from further open conflict with the authorities, their molestation in Qumran would not be expected. For on my view the sect was once allied with the Maccabees against the hellenizers and the Seleucids. The migration to Damascus took place under

<sup>1</sup> Here I am in agreement with Dupont-Sommer. Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 74 f. (Eng. trans., p. 60).



Jonathan or Simon, former allies of the sect, and while such defenders of the law and of the Zadokite priesthood as the members of the sect could not be expected to approve of the Hasmonaean assumption of the priesthood, the bitterness of their opposition would be altogether less than it had been to the idolatry and hellenism of the time of Antiochus. Hence peaceful withdrawal, instead of passionate battle, as in the days of Antiochus, would be understandable.

It remains only to add that the great significance attached to the life and death of the Teacher of Righteousness seems to have been but a temporary feature in the life of the sect. He is mentioned in some of the commentaries and in the Zadokite Work. The references to him are allusive, and must have been intelligible to the first readers of these works, though they are so obscure to us. Hence all these works were probably written within a very few years of his death. The Zadokite Work was written within forty years of his death, and it is probable that all the works that mention him fell within that period. He is not mentioned in the Manual of Discipline, and so far as we know no mention of his life or death figured in any of the rites of the sect. The most usual view is that the sect developed into the Essenes, of whom we have accounts in the writings of some authors of the first century of our era. Nowhere does the Teacher of Righteousness figure in those accounts. He belongs to the history of of the sect, but not to its faith.

The close links of the sectarian writings with I Enoch, Jubilees, and the sources of the Testaments, which I have examined elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> and the common background in a time of idolatry, apocalyptic hopes, and disputes about the calendar and the sabbath, strongly suggest that all spring from the critical conflicts of the Maccabaeian age. This view at least has the merit of attributing the rise of the sect to the period when current issues and conflicts occupied its thought.

I therefore adhere to the view of the Teacher of Righteousness to which I subscribed some years ago, and find the fuller study of the problems involved and the fuller evidence which is now in our hands confirms it. All the issues which specially interested the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1957).

sect were live issues in the period of which Antiochus Epiphanes and Onias are the focal figures on either side, and far more of the references in the Scrolls have relevance in that age than in any other. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> While this lecture has been in the press C. Roth and G. R. Driver have advocated the view that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be identified with Menahem, who lived in the first century A.D., and died in A.D. 66. This view was earlier presented by H. E. del Medico, who has now published a further book (*L'Enigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*) in its defence—also since this lecture went to press. All of these were too late to be examined here, but the present writer is still persuaded that any post-Christian date for the Teacher of Righteousness is excluded for the reasons stated in the lecture.

# THE GUILD OF ST. GEORGE : RUSKIN'S ATTEMPT TO TRANSLATE HIS IDEAS INTO PRACTICE <sup>1</sup>

By MARGARET E. SPENCE, M.A.

LECTURER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN  
THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

TO John Ruskin *Fors Clavigera* represented the last stage of the message he had first set out in his twenties in *Modern Painters*. It was the culmination of years of labour, and it carried the heaviest burden of his lifetime. He saw *Fors* as the virtual fulfilment of *Modern Painters* whose message had been advanced and developed through the years by such works as *The Stones of Venice*, *Unto This Last* and the Inaugural Oxford lectures. These works represented to him vehicles that carried part of the same message which, as he wrote :

knowing no more as I unfolded the scroll of it, what next would be written there, than a blade of grass knows what the form of its fruit shall be, I have been led on year by year to speak, even to this its end.<sup>2</sup>

He gave particular emphasis to this link between *Modern Painters* and *Fors*, when he wrote in *Fors*, Letter LXXVIII :

*Modern Painters* taught the claim of all lower nature on the hearts of men ; of the rock, and wave, and herb, as a part of their necessary spirit life ; in all that I now bid you to do, to dress the earth and keep it, I am fulfilling what I then began.<sup>3</sup>

*Fors* ended his message, and in his attempt to give practical application to his ideas expressed therein, he undertook the most exacting task of his life and the one which cost him popularity, friends and sanity. *Fors* was more than a mere statement of aim or thought, it was part of a major experiment made in the best of faith and carried out in the bravest manner. It is doubtful if a more generous attempt has ever been made by any individual to right social wrongs and to save suffering humanity. Before a

<sup>1</sup> Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Ruskin Trustees and to their publishers, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., for permission to include the various unpublished letters quoted in this article.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXVIII, p. 166 (London : George Allen and Unwin Ltd.)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.

consideration is made of Ruskin's ability to translate his ideas into practice, it is well first to consider what in fact were the positive ideas expressed in this last part of his message given in *Fors Clavigera* at regular monthly intervals during the years 1871 to 1878, and after that spasmodically between 1880 and 1884.

It is permissible to state that in *Fors* there is a two-way stream of ideas: those ideas presented with the purpose of exposing contemporary social evil and distress, and those presented in order to show a way out of the social muddle into happiness and greater security. The *Fors* letters, a monthly series beautifully printed and well set out, addressed to the workmen and labourers of Great Britain, were written as a result of Ruskin's deep feelings of distress at the acute poverty and misery prevalent everywhere. This intense awareness of suffering humanity developed in him a keen sense of responsibility of which he wrote in his first *Fors* letter, dated 1 January 1871:

I have listened to many ingenious persons, who say we are better off now than ever we were before. I do not know how well off we were before; but I know positively that many very deserving persons of my acquaintance have great difficulty in living under these improved circumstances: also, that my desk is full of begging letters, eloquently written either by distressed or dishonest people; and that we cannot be called, as a nation, well off, while so many of us are living either in honest or in villanous beggary.

For my own part, I will put up with this state of things, passively, not an hour longer. I am not an unselfish person, nor an Evangelical one; I have no particular pleasure in doing good; neither do I dislike doing it so much as to expect to be rewarded for it in another world. But I simply cannot paint, nor read, nor look at minerals, nor do anything else that I like, and the very light of the morning sky, when there is any—which is seldom, now-a-days, near London—has become hateful to me, because of the misery that I know of, and see signs of, where I know it not, which no imagination can interpret too bitterly.

Therefore, as I have said, I will endure it no longer quietly; but henceforward, with any few or many who will help, do my poor best to abate this misery.<sup>1</sup>

Such was his undertaking in *Fors* and the result of it was his Guild of St. George, a Society still in existence today, for which, after a weary seven-year struggle, he secured a legal constitution and recognition by the Board of Trade.

In *Fors*, Ruskin was slow to formulate his ideas about his Guild, and slower still to undertake any practical interpretation of them. It was his avowed policy to allow his ideas to circulate

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* 1, 1, p. 4.



for a number of years before embarking on any practical undertaking, in order to allow full play to his ideas that they might meet and measure public criticism. He wrote in Letter LVIII, dated October 1875 :

I knew they would only be mocked at, until by some years of persistence the scheme had run the course of the public talk, and until I had publicly challenged the denial of its principles in their abstract statement, long enough to show them to be invincible.<sup>1</sup>

The germ of the scheme that was ultimately to be known as the Guild of St. George rests on Ruskin's suggestion, made in his first *Fors* letter, that a portion of his income be set aside for the building up of a 'National Store' for the common good. This giving of tithe was to be a concerted effort :

each of us laying by something, according to our means, for the common service ; and having amongst us, at last, be it ever so small, a national Store instead of a National Debt. Store which, once securely founded, will fast increase, provided only you take the pains to understand, and have perseverance to maintain, the elementary principles of Human Economy, which have, of late, not only been lost sight of, but wilfully and formally entombed under pyramids of falsehood.<sup>2</sup>

At the back of this aim was the desire :

still to keep the fields of England green, and her cheeks red.<sup>3</sup>

The object of the fund was, as he stated in Letter V :

to begin, and gradually—no matter how slowly—to increase, the buying and securing of land in England, which shall not be built upon, but cultivated by Englishmen, with their own hands, and such help of force as they can find in wind and wave.<sup>4</sup>

And so he straightway dedicated his forthcoming endeavours to the securing of land that was to be hand cultivated, and not contaminated by the use of any steam driven machinery. These were the conditions which he laid down when appealing for help in this undertaking :

We will try to make some small piece of English ground, beautiful, peaceful, and fruitful. We will have no steam-engines upon it, and no railroads ; we will have no untended or unthought-of creatures on it ; none wretched, but the sick ; none idle, but the dead. We will have no liberty upon it ; but instant obedience to known law, and appointed persons : no equality upon it ; but recognition of every betterness that we can find, and reprobation of every worseness. When we want to go anywhere, we will go there quietly and safely, not at forty miles an hour in

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LVIII, p. 284.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid* p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* I, I, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* I, V, p. 23.

the risk of our lives ; when we want to carry anything anywhere, we will carry it either on the backs of beasts, or on our own, or in carts, or boats ; we will have plenty of flowers and vegetables in our gardens, plenty of corn and grass in our fields,—and few bricks. We will have some music and poetry ; the children shall learn to dance to it and sing it;—perhaps some of the old people, in time, may also.<sup>1</sup>

He was not interested in the kind of land to be secured for, as he wrote in *Fors* :

I do not care where the land is, nor of what quality. I would rather it should be poor, for I want space more than food. I will make the best of it that I can, at once, by wage-labour, under the best agricultural advice.<sup>2</sup>

He regarded barren ground as a better challenge since—and this was very important to him—those who tilled it would be working for the good of future generations and not for selfish end. But whatever the quality of the land, the treatment of it was always to be such as would secure :

the absolute best that can be made of every acre.<sup>3</sup>

Study was to be made of the nature of the soil, the flowers and plants that grew there, and every effort was to be made to increase fertility :

“ Whatever piece of land we begin work upon ” he vowed in Letter VIII, “ we shall treat thoroughly at once, putting unlimited manual labour on it, until we have every foot of it under as strict care as a flower-garden.”<sup>4</sup>

Ruskin constantly reminded his readers that these ideas expressed in *Fors* were ages old :

St. George’s arrangements, which are to take the hills, streams, and fields that God has made for us ; to keep them lovely, pure, and orderly as we can ; to gather their carefully cultivated fruit in due season ; and if our children then multiply so that we cannot feed them, to seek other lands to cultivate in like manner,—these arrangements, I repeat, will be found very advantageous indeed, as they always have been ; wheresoever even in any minor degree enforced.<sup>5</sup>

He acknowledged the Tyrol as the immediate source of influence, writing in *Fors*, Letter XI :

I hold it an entirely practical proceeding, since I find my ideal of felicity actually produced in the Tyrol, to set about the production of it, here, on Tyrolese principles ; which, you will find, on inquiry, have not hitherto implied the employment of steam, nor submission to the great Universal law of Supply and Demand, nor even Demand for the local Supply of a “ Liberal ” government.

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, V, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* IV, XXXVII, p. 8

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* I, VIII, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> *Fors* VI, LXIX, p. 277.

But they do imply labour of all hands on pure earth and in fresh air. They do imply obedience to government which endeavours to be just, and faith in a religion which endeavours to be moral. And they result in strength of limbs, clearness of throats, roundness of waists, and pretty jackets, and still prettier corsets to fit them.<sup>1</sup>

In his attempt to produce this ideal of felicity in *Fors*, he expounded on the evils of the modern political economists, particularly John Stuart Mill, a veritable *Fors* target. He extolled the virtues of manual labour which alone could produce food, fuel and clothing from land and sea ; above all, he tried to give his readers understanding of certain basic principles concerning the government of a country. He gave frequent emphasis to the fact that the successful working of a government was dependent on two things : on an obedient people and on intelligent governors of high moral worth. He strove to make his readers realize that more important than the actual form of government was the moral quality of the men who served in it. He listed the three principal duties of any government : to provide food, fuel and clothes ; to provide moral and intellectual education, and to care for the destitute. In his frequent reminders in *Fors* that only by manual effort, could food, fuel and clothes be produced from land and sea, he echoed—consciously or unconsciously—those teachings with which he was so familiar in Xenophon's *Economist*. He exalted the manual labourer and was quick to show that the scholar, painter, and musician were, by comparison, parasites since they secured their food, fuel and clothes only through the physical efforts of others—namely, of the manual labourer. It naturally followed that he condemned any system of government that permitted usury through the letting of land or sea ; he was as quick to condemn the improvident nation that imported food, or brought the misery of unemployment to her people by the use of steam-driven machinery on the land.

It is possible that it was the memory of the Tyrolean peasant costume which caused him later in *Fors*, when building up a Utopian vision of his St. George's Company, to make decrees concerning the regulation of dress. He allowed himself this flight of fancy in Letter LVIII, when he outlined a happy

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, XI, p. 18.

existence for his Company. He first gave details about the National Store he planned to set up and wrote :

The store of the St. George's Company, then, is to be primarily of food ; next of materials for clothing and covert ; next of books and works of art,—food, clothes, books, and works of art being all good, and every poisonous condition of any of them destroyed.<sup>1</sup>

From there he went on to particularize about the grain to be used, the vintage of the wine—"pure" and "not less than ten years old", the wood to be used in building—"seasoned oak and pine" and, in great detail and to his obvious delight, the purest gold and silver currency. Of it he wrote :

the ducat and half-ducat in gold, the florin, penny, half-penny, and one-fifth of a penny in silver ; the smaller coins being beat thin and pierced, the halfpenny with two, the one-fifth of a penny with five, apertures.<sup>2</sup>

It was with evident enjoyment that he described the stamps the individual coins were to bear. He described in detail the "absolutely pure gold" ducat, whose weight was slightly to exceed the weight of the English sovereign :

On one of its sides it will bear the figure of the archangel Michael ; on the reverse, a branch of Alpine rose : above the rose-branch, the words "Sit Splendor" ; above the Michael, "Fiat voluntas" ; under the rose-branch, "sicut in coelo" ; under the Michael, "et in terrâ", with the year of the coinage : and round the edge of the coin, "Domini".<sup>3</sup>

The penny was to bear :

St. George's shield on one side and the English daisy on the other, without inscription.<sup>4</sup>

He laid down certain stringent currency rules :

The sum of the entire currency, in and out of circulation, will be given annually on every note issued (no issues of currency being made but on the first day of the year), and in each district, every morning, the quantities of the currency in and out of circulation in that district will be placarded at the doors of the government district bank.<sup>5</sup>

The Company's store was to consist also of uncut gems, and a selected series of classics which was to be accessible to all in every village library.

While it is true to state that Ruskin did in fact build up a National Store in so far as he set up a museum in which were

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LVIII, p. 285.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 288.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 287.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 287.



uncut gems, rare texts, and works of art, and he also secured several plots of land, he did not seriously at any time ever envisage the practical realization of his Utopian vision. This higher flight of fancy—and positively, it was no more—has, down the years since his death been seized as laughing point by many writers of repute and standing. Such, quite simply, was his Utopian dream. He was not dismayed by the loud jeers of the daily press, but he hated the popular misconception that he was seeking to found a colony where the poor would be made rich, and the sad, happy. He had no faith in monastic orders that sought to save the world by withdrawing from it and, moreover, he was horrified that he should be regarded by anyone as the leader or champion of a new movement. As early as 1873, in Letter XXX, he stated his position emphatically :

to state clearly what must be done by all of us, as we can, in our place ; and to fulfil what duty I personally acknowledge to the State ; also I have promised, if I live, to show some example of what I know to be necessary, if no more able person will show it first. That is a very different thing from pretending to leadership in a movement which must one day be as wide as the world. Nay, even my marching days may perhaps soon be over, and the best that I can make of myself be a faithful signpost.<sup>1</sup>

On another occasion he described his present endeavours as :

Mere raft-making in the midst of irrevocable wreck.<sup>2</sup>

He set his faith on the basic simplicity of his idea which rested on the acceptable, indisputable assumption that :

washed faces are healthier than dirty ones, whole clothes decenter than ragged ones, kind behaviour more serviceable than malicious, and pure air pleasanter than foul.<sup>3</sup>

On some pages of *Fors* he might write of Utopia and linger in enjoyment over the vision, but on other pages he made infinitely clear the fact that his aim was no more than to indicate, by practical illustration, the obvious road that all should follow. Unlike many others who write of the fair land, he spent a great part of his fortune in his attempt to “make her a happy England”. It was a difficult task and he was particularly sensitive about making appeals for subscriptions. In Letter XXXVII he wrote :

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* III, XXX, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* V, L, p. 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* IV, XXXVII, p. 12.

For my own part, I entirely hate the whole business : I dislike having either power or responsibility ; am ashamed to ask for money, and plagued in spending it.<sup>1</sup>

but he vowed :

unless I am struck with palsy, I do not seriously doubt my perseverance, until I find somebody able to take up the matter in the same mind, and with a better heart.<sup>2</sup>

Nobody came forward to take up the matter and so he persisted in his task for many years—it was no mere quixotic humour. As long as he had health and strength, he never attempted to evade this responsibility which, rightly or wrongly, he believed to be his.

Three years after the publication of his first *Fors* letter, Ruskin wrote in January 1874 :

I have not hitherto stated, except in general terms, the design to which these letters point, though it has been again and again defined, and it seems to me explicitly enough—the highest possible education, namely, of English men and women living by agriculture in their native land.<sup>3</sup>

He then gave clear indication of his intention :

The substantial wealth of man consists in the earth he cultivates, with its pleasant or serviceable animals and plants, and in the rightly produced work of his own hands. I mean to buy, for the St. George's Company, the first pieces of ground offered to me at fair price, (when the subscriptions enable me to give *any* price),—to put them as rapidly as possible into order, and to settle upon them as many families as they can support, of young and healthy persons, on the condition that they do the best they can for their livelihood with their own hands, and submit themselves and their children to the rules written for them.<sup>4</sup>

In this specific statement of the work to be done Ruskin explained that his tenants (and he made clear his preference for “young couples of the higher classes”) would be selected for him by experienced landlords. He referred to the laws binding tenancy agreements : first, the probationary year, next the three-year lease and finally, with the ultimate possibility of buying the land, the life-long lease at a rent consisting only of a tithe of the land's produce. At this stage in his planning he contemplated the appointment of an overseer to act as advisory agent on land cultivation. And the rules and regulations he laid down were formed to produce, so far as possible, a

<sup>1</sup> *Fors.*, IV. XXXVII, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 8.

self-supporting community in which trade and the importing of goods were reduced to a minimum and steam driven engines banished. The provision which he made for educational needs embraced adult no less than child :

The children will be required to attend training schools for bodily exercise, and music, with such other education as I have already described. Every household will have its library, given it from the fund, and consisting of a fixed number of volumes,—some constant, the others chosen by each family out of a list of permitted books, from which they afterwards may increase their library if they choose. The formation of this library for choice, by a republication of classical authors in standard forms, has long been a main object with me. No newspapers, nor any books but those named in the annually renewed lists, are to be allowed in any household. In time I hope to get a journal published, containing notice of any really important matters taking place in this or other countries, in the closely sifted truth of them.<sup>1</sup>

This love of truth made him virtually a cultural dictator. The programme which he devised for his St. George's Schools was written in the shade of Plato, with music and dancing the subjects of prime importance. "Skill in useful manual work" might well be taken as his educational slogan, and in his rejection of the three Rs as the groundwork of primary education, he made huge attack on the contemporary system. He made the following comment on his general educational purpose in Letter XIV :

I begin to give these letters the completed character I intend for them ; first, as it may seem to me needful, commenting on what is passing at the time, with reference always to the principles and plans of economy I have to set before you ; and then collecting out of past literature, and in occasional frontispieces or woodcuts, out of past art, what may confirm or illustrate things that are forever true : choosing the pieces of the series so that, both in art and literature, they may become to you in the strictest sense, educational, and familiarise you with the look and manner of fine work.<sup>2</sup>

The setting up of a Museum at Sheffield was his bravest and finest attempt thus to make his readers familiar with that "look and manner of fine work".

To Ruskin the whole undertaking, the writing of *Fors*, the establishing of his Guild of St. George, and his own generous contributions of time and money to it were merely actions dictated by common-sense. He gave simple interpretations of his undertaking in Letter IX :

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* IV. XXXXVII, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* II, XIV, p. 12.

To divert a little of the large current of English charity and justice from watching disease to guarding health, and from the punishment of crime to the reward of virtue ; to establish, here and there, exercise grounds instead of hospitals, and training schools instead of penitentiaries, is not, if you will slowly take it to heart, a frantic imagination.<sup>1</sup>

He was opposed to, as he was irritated by, Victorian notions of charity. He wrote emphatically in Letter XIX :

My alms-people are to be the ablestbodied I can find ; the ablestminded I can make ; and from ten to four every day will be on duty.<sup>2</sup>

He sought help from able-bodied, receptive people, and he looked for support mainly from those of his readers who had followed with sympathetic understanding his writings during the 1860 to 1870 decade. In answer to the popular criticism that his Company was to be a refuge he wrote :

Alas, this is not by any means the notion of the St. George's Company. It is to be a band of delivering knights—not of churls needing deliverance ; of eager givers and servants—not of eager beggars, and persons needing service. It is only the Rich, and the Strong, whom I receive for Companions,—those who come not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Rich, yet some of them in other kind of riches than the world's ; strong, yet some in other than the world's strength. But this much at least of literal wealth and strength they *must* have,—the power, and formed habit, of self-support.<sup>3</sup>

Ruskin envisaged three classes of companion : the companion servant whose day was spent on guild work ; the companion militant at work either on St. George's land, or on a specific task set by the Master ; and the companion consular. This last class of companion, while contributing a tithe, remained in his own profession or occupation, but vowed to preserve in it the highest standard of honesty. On one occasion in *Fors* Ruskin reduced the qualification for membership of his company or guild to the following requirement :

Anyone, therefore, may be a Companion of St. George who sincerely does what they can, to make themselves useful, and earn their daily bread by their own labour.<sup>4</sup>

As he saw it, he had no hard demands to make of his companions for, he argued, he asked neither for the monk's enthusiasm, nor for the knight's courage. On the other hand, he demanded implicit obedience. In short, companions were to accept as full

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, IX, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* II, XIX, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* VI, LXIII, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* VI, LXVII, p. 212.



and absolute authority Ruskin's decrees as Master of the Guild. They were, moreover, to accept his rulings on the admission of companions, on the appointment or non-appointment of officers, and on the expenditure of the Guild's funds. When at length Ruskin reached the stage of framing a constitution for his Company, he ruled that while the Master in power should have authority equal to that of a Roman Dictator, he could, at any meeting of the Guild, be deposed by a majority vote against him.

Such then were, in the main, some of the general ideas about his Guild of St. George which Ruskin circulated in *Fors Clavigera* during the years of persuasion. It must be recollected that these years of persuasion were to Ruskin years of phenomenally hard work—even for him—as professor, teacher, author, critic and, maybe the most exhausting of all, correspondent to the many earnest enthusiasts (mainly women) who wrote to him for advice when they were really seeking friendship.

Apart from these diverse activities and public duties, the task of publicizing his ideas about his Guild of St. George by the writing of his monthly *Fors* letter was formidable enough, but even then his work did not end there. He still had two onerous burdens to carry in connection with his Guild: first, he had to establish the Guild and win for it a legal constitution—a seven year burden; and second, he had to administer the society when founded, and act as Master with full powers and responsibility vested in him. Perhaps of these two burdens, the work of establishing the Guild proved the heavier, and it might be well now to consider Ruskin's practical work as founder of the Guild of St. George.

The first decisive step taken by Ruskin to translate his ideas into practice was in May 1871 when he proposed to set up a fund and made solemn promise to contribute to it. This was the public promise he made in *Fors*, Letter V:

The tenth of whatever is left to me, estimated as accurately as I can, (you shall see the accounts) I will make over to you in perpetuity, with the best security that English law can give, on Christmas Day of this year, with engagement to add the tithe of whatever I earn afterwards.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, V, p. 22.

Two months later, in Letter VIII, he intimated the amount of his tithe as it could so far be estimated :

Now you know I promised you the tenth of all I had, when free from encumbrances already existing on it. This first instalment of 14,000£ is not all clear, for I want to found a Mastership of Drawing under the Art Professorship at Oxford ; which I can't do rightly for less than 5,000£. But I'll count the sum left as 10,000£ instead of 9,000£, and that will be clear for our society, and so, you shall have a thousand pounds down, as the tenth of that, which will quit me, observe, of my pledge thus far.<sup>1</sup>

He straightway secured the services of two eminent Victorians, Sir Thomas Dyke Acland and the Right Honourable William Cowper-Temple, as trustees of the fund which he named the "St. George's Fund"—but he was emphatic that beyond this establishment of the fund no further action would be taken meantime. He invited others to contribute, reminding his readers that such money was a gift not an investment :

It is a frank and simple gift to the British people ; nothing of it is to come back to the giver.<sup>2</sup>

People were slow to respond to this invitation, but within nine months of his first *Fors* publication he received a gift of seven acres of woodland in Worcestershire from a wealthy Birmingham merchant, George Baker, who was ultimately to succeed Ruskin as Master of the Guild. This gift Ruskin announced in a footnote to Letter IX :

Since last *Fors* was published I have sold some more property, which has brought me in another ten thousand to tithe ; so that I have bought a second thousand consols in the names of the Trustees—and have received a pretty little gift of seven acres of woodland, in Worcestershire, for you, already—so you see there is at least a beginning.<sup>3</sup>

But he made no proposal about tending, or even inspecting, the land. He was conscious even at this early stage in his endeavours of hampering legal restrictions, and he made some reference to them in this letter. His Christmas letter again touched on legal matters :

At least, however, you will be glad to know that I have really made you the Christmas gift I promised—7,000£ consols, in all, clear ; a fair tithe of what I had : and to as much perpetuity as the law will allow me. It will not allow the dead to have their own way long, whatever license it grants the living in their

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, VIII, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* I, IX, p. 21.

humours : and this seems to me unkind to those helpless ones ;—very certainly it is inexpedient for the survivors.<sup>1</sup>

He then explained the difficulty that faced him :

As it stands, I can only vest my gift in trustees, desiring them, in the case of my death, immediately to appoint their own successors, and in such continued succession, to apply the proceeds of the St. George's fund to the purchase of land in England and Scotland, which shall be cultivated to the utmost attainable fruitfulness and beauty by the labour of man and beast thereon, such men and beasts receiving at the same time the best education attainable by the trustees for labouring creatures, according to the terms stated in this book, *Fors Clavigera*.<sup>2</sup>

He was unable to make the permanent settlement which he wished and he wrote somewhat frustratedly :

I cannot, because of the lawyers I was talking of last month, get it given you in a permanent and accumulative form.<sup>3</sup>

It was not until the second year of his venture that he formed his Company of St. George and invited his readers to join. He was delighted in June to announce the first gift of money from a stranger and so to declare his fund formally opened. By the end of the year he was able to report that from his six subscribers he had received the total amount of £104 15s. and he added complacently :

It is a beginning. We shall get on in time—better than some companies that have started with large capital.<sup>4</sup>

Twelve months later, he could report increase of only nine subscribers to his fund which now amounted to £236 13s. although over a thousand copies of *Fors* had been sold. Again, at the end of 1874, he could report only slow progress despite the four years of mendicancy. For this he blamed his earlier failures in other practical experiments of which he gave some account in Letter XLVIII. He described his unsuccessful tea shop venture at Paddington, where, for the dual purpose of employing two of his mother's aged servants and helping the poor, tea made up in small quantities was cheaply sold. There business languished, and for this Ruskin blamed himself for his slowness in making a decision about the form and colour of the outside signboard. For his failure to keep clean and pure a

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* I, XII, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* II, XVII, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* II, XXIV, p. 25.

spring at Carshalton, that he sought to have dedicated to his Mother's memory, he blamed the muddy spring water and the careless parishioners ; while he accounted for his failure in the clean sweeping of St. Giles, by blaming himself for an unfortunate choice of district and for not adequately supervising the proceedings. He made no mention of the fact that this simple and surely inoffensive experiment in road-sweeping brought him cruel abuse in the press. In *Fors* Ruskin argued that he had failed in these and other practical undertakings only because he was unable to devote his time wholly to them. Nevertheless, he reminded his readers that he had learned from these past experiences and that the financial loss incurred was entirely his own.

The year 1874, however, was memorable in that it brought him a new gift of land for his Guild, as well as a devoted friend and patron, Mrs. Fanny Talbot. Guild histories and biographies of Ruskin to date make little reference to this lady who received between 1874 and 1889 some 365 letters from him. This important collection of letters, together with other manuscripts and papers of vital importance to the history of the Guild, have lately been generously presented to the John Rylands Library by a member of the Guild of St. George, Mrs. Rawnsley of Grasmere, Westmorland, who, with her husband, the late Canon H. D. Rawnsley, was also devoted to Ruskin. The importance of these letters to the history of the Guild is the subject matter of a detailed work that has lately been completed. It is sufficient here to state that the letters give a vivid and vital picture of Ruskin's feelings during the years of his main endeavour for the Guild. As well as providing a refreshing commentary, they also give a pleasing glimpse of a Ruskin relaxed, happily playing chess by correspondence with her.

Ruskin's excitement in December 1874 when he learned of Mrs. Talbot's projected gift was intense and he wrote to his friend Macdonald about it :

My dear Macdonald,

I have been able now to read Mrs. Talbot's letter—it seems the kindest and most wonderful and most pretty beginning for me that could be—and there's not the slightest fear of the St. George's Company ever parting with an inch of



anything they get hold of!—if that is indeed the only fear in question—but do I rightly understand this letter as an offer to us of a piece of freehold land, with cottages on it—as a gift!—Don't send the note if I misunderstand—but if I am right please enclose it to Mrs. Talbot with yours—for there is no spot in England or Wales I should like better to begin upon in *any* case—please ask for me more particulars about the extent of land—state and circumstances of cottages etc.

—and believe me

Ever gratefully Yours,

J. Ruskin.<sup>1</sup>

Too excited even to wait for Macdonald to reply, he enclosed the above letter in a note to Mrs. Talbot with the explanation :

I meant to send the enclosed to Mr. Macdonald—but—for fear of his not being at home in time I venture to address it at once to you, with most true thanks for the kind expression and intentions of your letter—on which I only fear to presume too far.<sup>2</sup>

Some few days later he wrote again formally to accept the cottages and to indicate his plans for them :

The ground and houses which you offer me are exactly the kind of property I wish most to obtain for the St. George's company : I accept them at once with very glad thanks ; and will endeavour soon to come and see them and thank you and your son in person.—No cottager shall be disturbed—but—in quiet and slow ways assisted—as each may deserve or wish—to better their own houses in sanitary and comfortable points.—My principle is to work with the minutest possible touches—but with steady end in view—and by developing as I can—the energy of the people I want to help.<sup>3</sup>

To her son, Quarry Talbot, an aspiring artist with whom he had earlier slight acquaintance, he wrote on 18 December 1874 for information about the cottagers who were now to be St. George's tenants ;

I need not say—in any too tiresome repetition—that I am most grateful to your mother and you, for your gift and thought. As I have taken her at her word, so you also I trust, and will ask you therefore to be at the pains to tell me something of the character & means of livelihood of the people now on this plot of land. Judging by this photograph, the cottages seem so respectable and so well kept, as compared with our Cumberland ones, that I should think very little encouragement necessary to get all done that may be desirable for them, by their own energy. I cannot make out what the walls are for, near the top of the ground—and the line defining the property seems to ignore all expressed limitations of such a kind. It will be necessary to mark the St. George's limits very carefully, at first in order not to have any legal difficulties if I fence the whole when I've got anything worth taking care of.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/1a. n.d.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1161/1. 10.12.1874.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 1161/3. n.d.

<sup>4</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1163/1. 18.12.74.

He ended his letter with a promise to see to the house drainage.

Despite the fact that he had already experienced legal difficulty in connection with the giving of his tithe to the Society, Ruskin in his first acceptance of Mrs. Talbot's gift of land and cottages at Barmouth seemed singularly unconscious of major legal problems relating to its possession. He wrote to Mrs. Talbot in January 1875 :

My delay in writing was entirely owing to the Trustee's not having decided whether to act through their lawyers or mine—I only heard from Mr. Temple yesterday :—he wishes my own lawyer to arrange the matter with your's ; and if indeed any doubt could exist respecting the usefulness to me of your gift, I would myself at once follow your kind suggestion and come down to Barmouth. But there is no question at all. *Any* land—*any* buildings offered me I would take—but these are just the kind and in the kind of place I should like best.

and he concluded optimistically :

Now my dear Madam, the *defining* of boundaries is lawyers' business—and I think your's and mine should settle it for us. Will you kindly tell yours to draw up a deed defining the limits properly, with measured map of the ground accurately drawn :—when it is ready, I will send down a friend to examine the spot and see that any questionable points are cleared.—He will bring up the deed to my lawyer, and I hope we shall have no further difficulty.<sup>1</sup>

A later letter dated 3 February 1875 anticipated the legal need for definition of the St. George's Company and he made hasty, and altogether inadequate, suggestion :

Your solicitor will I doubt not require explanation of the nature of St. George's company, such as can be put in legal documents. If no simple form such as " The St. George's company formed under the direction or directorship (I wrote 'dict'—just now in beginning 'director'—that missing of letters I consider one of the most definite signs of great nervous exhaustion) of J. R. of Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford, for the education of English peasantry ", will stand in law, you must just transfer the land straight to *me* without verbal restraint and trust me to do right with it.<sup>2</sup>

But in *Fors*, Letter L, he gave glimpse of the legal trouble ahead :

An acre of ground, with some cottages on it, has been given me for our Company ; but it is not easy to find out how the company is to lay hold of it. I suppose the conveyancing will cost us, in the end, half a dozen times the value of the land ; and in the meantime I don't care to announce our possession of it, or say what I mean to do with it.<sup>3</sup>

In order to " lay hold " of the land and legally establish his Company of St. George, Ruskin secured the services of leading

<sup>1</sup> Rylands Eng. MS, 1161/3. 29.1.75.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1162.4. 3.2.75.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* V, L, p. 47.

Counsel, William Barber. Barber's task was to draw up in terms that would satisfy the legal requirements of the Board of Trade a Memorandum and Statutes of the Company of St. George from Ruskin's own statement of his aims and objects. At length, in July 1875, in Letter LV, Ruskin published Barber's Memorandum and Statutes and, after making some amendments himself, he invited his readers to comment on it.

This Memorandum gave clear statement of the Company's aim which, with Ruskin's amendment, finally read :

The Company is constituted with the object of determining and instituting in practice the wholesome laws of agricultural life and economy and of instructing the agricultural labourer in such science art and literature as are properly connected with husbandry.

With this object it is proposed to acquire by gift purchase or otherwise plots or tracts of land in different parts of the country which will be brought into such state of cultivation or left uncultivated or turned into waste or common land and applied to such purposes as having regard to the nature of the soil and other surrounding circumstances may in each case be thought to be most generally useful.<sup>1</sup>

The clause concerning membership as drawn up by Barber infuriated Ruskin, because it made membership of the Company determined by fixed subscription, and he stated categorically :

Nothing can be required as a condition of entrance, except the consent of the Master, and signature promising obedience to the laws.<sup>2</sup>

The Memorandum gave details of the solemn ceremony of entering names of Companions on the Roll of Companions and the safe keeping of this Roll. The importance of this ceremony, which in a measure forecast the vow that Ruskin was shortly to formulate, was stressed :

Each Companion shall by virtue of the entry of his name on the Roll be deemed to have bound himself by a solemn vow and promise as strict as if the same had been ratified by oath to be true and loyal to the Company and to the best of his power and might so far as in him lies to forward and advance the objects and interests thereof and faithfully to keep and obey the statutes and rules thereof yet so nevertheless that he shall not be bound in any way to harass annoy injure or inconvenience his neighbour.<sup>3</sup>

The full powers of the Master were stated and information given about the work and status of " Retainers of the Company "—those at work supervising or managing Company property. It is

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LV, p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 210.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 206.

a curious fact that in the history of the Guild there has never been a retainer. The Memorandum also set out the principle of rent :

The rents and profits to be derived from the estates and properties of the Company shall be applied in the first instance in the development of land [here Ruskin added —“ to the development and enlargement of the Society's operations also ”] and the physical intellectual moral social and religious improvement of the residents thereon in such manner as the Master shall from time to time direct or approve and the surplus rents and profits if any shall be applied in reduction of the amount paid by the tenants in proportion to their respective skill and industry either by a gradual remission of rent towards the close of the tenancy or in such other way as may be thought best but in no case shall the Companions personally derive any rents or profits from the property of the Company.<sup>1</sup>

So far as the vesting of property was concerned, the Memorandum read :

All land and hereditaments for the time being belonging to the Company shall be conveyed to and vested in any two or more of the Companions whom the Master may from time to time select for the office as Trustees of the Company and shall be dealt with by them according to the directions of the Master.<sup>2</sup>

To this Ruskin objected :

I do not think the Master should have the power of choosing the Trustees. I was obliged to do so, before any Society was in existence ; but the Trustees have to verify the Master's accounts, and otherwise act as a check upon him. They must not, therefore, be chosen by him.<sup>3</sup>

Such then were some of the general ideas expressed in the legal statement of the Company of St. George. It is evident that Ruskin, satisfied with the amended document, believed that his Company was as good as legally established. The satisfaction was short-lived, however, for in Letter LXVI he quoted a letter from his solicitors which contained the following clear statement :

If you desire to have a legal Company, or the supervision of the Charity Commissioners, you must give way in many points which you have hitherto considered indispensable to your scheme.<sup>4</sup>

Ruskin's reply which he also quoted in this letter showed frank disillusionment :

Now I find at the last moment that neither Mr. Barber nor anybody else can *give* us a piece of land at all, but must sell it us.

and he ended :

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LV, p. 208.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 209.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* VI, LXVI, p. 190.



Fix your mind, and Mr. Barber's on this one point—the grip of the land. If you can't give us that, send in your accounts, and let us be done with the matter.<sup>1</sup>

Ruskin did not appreciate the fact that his solicitors had no precedent to follow in trying to win a legal constitution for his Company. Nor were his solicitors at first fully aware of the fact that the case was unique, and for many long months they investigated the possibility of assimilating the non-profit winning Company of St. George to a commercial undertaking. As long as they worked along these lines they failed and Ruskin, despairing, resolved to leave all legal matters :

in the hands of our companion Mr. Somervell, and in the claws of the English faculty of Law.<sup>2</sup>

He made the following comment on this action in Letter LXVIII:

I perceive that it is out of my power to give the Company a legal status, according to the present law of England, unless it be permitted to gather dividends for itself, instead of store for the nation, and to put its affairs in the hands of a number of persons who know nothing about them, instead of in the hands of one person who is acquainted with them.

Under these circumstances, I consider it to be best that the companions should settle their own legal status with the lawyers ; and this the more, as I do not choose to run the Society into farther expense by the continuance of correspondence between these legal gentlemen and me, without the slightest chance of either party ever understanding the other.<sup>3</sup>

And so he temporarily left the scene of legal battle.

Despite these long frustrating legal anxieties which absorbed so much of his time and energy, Ruskin's enthusiasm for his Society remained. In Letter LVI, published in August 1875, he gave notice of the most significant action he ever took on behalf of the Guild. The notes and correspondence section of this letter told of his new undertaking :

I have become responsible, as the Master of the Company, for rent or purchase of a room at Sheffield, in which I propose to place some books and minerals, as the germ of a museum arranged first for workers in iron, and extended into illustration of the natural history of the neighbourhood of Sheffield, and more especially of the geology and flora of Derbyshire.<sup>4</sup>

The setting up of the Museum was a never failing pleasure and interest to him, and as long as his strength prevailed over many bouts of brain fever, he devoted himself to it. As age and

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VI, LXVI, p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXIV, p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* VI, LXVII, p. 229.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* V, LVI, p. 233.

illness advanced, he grew weary of the Guild problems and some of its querulous members, but he never wearied of his Museum for working men at Sheffield.

The following letter, Letter LVII, told of further activity taken towards the establishment of the Guild. This time Ruskin had to report that he was attempting to frame a vow or creed which companions would be called upon to sign. It proved a singularly difficult task and he wrote somewhat impatiently in Letter LVII :

The fact being that I am, at this central time of my life's work, at pause because I cannot set down any form of religious creed so simple, but that the requirement of its faithful signature by persons desiring to become Companions of St. George, would exclude some of the noblest champions of justice and charity now labouring for men.<sup>1</sup>

The vow, when once it was written out to his satisfaction, was published in October 1875 in Letter LVIII. Acceptance of the vow provided another condition of membership, and there was also a certain formality attached to it for it had to be written out by hand and, as Ruskin stated :

signed with the solemnity of a vow, by every person received into the St. George's Company.<sup>2</sup>

The vow is essentially a happy statement of belief that dwells on the loving and living God, and on the nobility of men. It calls for love of God, service to man and the preserving of all lovely things of nature. A typical clause reads :

I will not kill nor hurt any living creature needlessly, nor destroy any beautiful thing, but will strive to save and comfort all gentle life, and guard and perfect all natural beauty, upon the earth.<sup>3</sup>

and another :

I will strive to raise my own body and soul daily into higher powers of duty and happiness ; not in rivalry or contention with others, but for the help, delight, and honour of others, and for the joy and peace of my own life.<sup>4</sup>

His final call was for loyalty and devotion and obedience to the laws of the country, to the crown, and to society. He was yet a step nearer to the establishment of his Society.

He had further evidence of practical work in Sheffield, and was delighted to be able to report the first purchase for the

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LVII, p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LVIII, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

Museum of ten Turner engravings at a cost of £29 10s. He gave details of his Sheffield major purchase in Letter LX :

. . . we had a balance of £501 7s. at the bank, which balance I have taken, and advanced another hundred of my own, making £600, to buy the Sheffield property with : this advance I shall repay myself as the interest comes in, or farther subscription ; and then use such additional sums for the filling of the museum, and building a small curator's house on the ground. But I shall not touch any of the funded sum ; and hope soon to see it raised to £10,000. I have no word yet from our lawyer about our constitution. The Sheffield property, like the funded, stands in the names of the Trustees.

I have accepted, out of our forty subscribers, some eight or nine for Companions, very gratefully. Others wish well to the cause, but dislike the required expression of creed and purpose. I use no persuasion in the matter, wishing to have complete harmony of feeling among the active members of the Society.<sup>1</sup>

Membership showed some increase during the first part of 1876 and Ruskin in the February *Fors* reported that of his fifty-four subscribers twenty were companions. He also reported, accurately as he believed, that the Society was now legally in existence. Further satisfaction came to him from the appointment of Henry Swan as Curator. Swan, a former pupil of Ruskin's at the Working Men's College, proved an altogether admirable curator whom the workmen respected. But despite this progress made, as the year advanced the Company languished. It is possible that Ruskin's withdrawal from the legal issue was responsible for the decline in membership and in November 1876, he wrote :

The entire pause in subscriptions, and cessation of all serviceable offers of Companionship, during the last six months, may perhaps be owing in some measure to the continued delay in the determination of our legal position. I am sure that Mr. Somervell, who has communicated with the rest of the Companions on the subject, is doing all that is possible to give our property a simply workable form of tenure ; and then, I trust, things will progress ; but, whether they do or not, at the close of this seventh year, if I live, I will act with all the funds then at my disposal.<sup>2</sup>

Ruskin's major activity, in this year of resolution, was the purchase of a piece of land for a few Sheffield working men who were eager to work allotments in their leisure. He wrote about this action from Venice in Letter LXXVI which he dated 4 March 1877 :

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LX, p. 351.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXIII, p. 20.

A few of the Sheffield working-men who admit the possibility of St. George's notions being just, have asked me to let them rent some ground from the Company, whereupon to spend what spare hours they have, of morning or evening, in useful labour. I have accordingly authorized the sale of £1,200 worth of our stock, to be re-invested on a little estate near Sheffield, of thirteen acres, with good water supply. The workmen undertake to St. George for his three per cent ; and if they get tired of the bargain, the land will be always worth our stock. I have no knowledge yet of the men's plans in detail ; nor, as I have said in the text, shall I much interfere with them, until I see how they develope themselves. But here is at last a little piece of England given into the English workman's hand, and heaven's.<sup>1</sup>

He was delighted at this request, but, unfortunately the purchase threw the Society into some confusion, since both trustees resigned when he insisted that the property be bought. The loss of the services of Dyke Acland and Cowper-Temple was a grievous blow to Ruskin and the Society for in quality and status they were, as Ruskin was to find, virtually irreplaceable. Hard at work in Venice at the time of the actual purchase of land, Ruskin wrote of the event in *Fors*, Letter LXXVII dated Easter 1877 :

No details have yet reached me of the men's plan at Sheffield ; but the purchase of their land may be considered as affected " if the titles are good ". No doubt is intimated on this matter ; and I think I have already expressed my opinion of the wisdom of requiring a fresh investigation of title on every occasion of the sale of property ; so that, as my days here in Venice are surcharged with every kind of anger and indignation already, I will not farther speak at present of the state of the British Law.<sup>2</sup>

The next *Fors* letter, dated May 1877, carried the following comment on the resignation of his trustees :

the explanations which, now that the Company is actually beginning its work, I felt it due to our trustees to give, more clearly than heretofore, of its necessary methods of action respecting land, have issued in the resignation of our present trustees, with the immediately resulting necessity that the estate of Abbeydale should be vested in me only until I can find new trustees.<sup>3</sup>

Immediately in his search for new trustees, he consulted George Baker, reporting to him that Quarry Talbot had agreed to act, " but ", he added, " I should thankfully accept any person whom you suggested ". He was to learn, however, that he was unable to make any such appointment until the first official meeting of the Guild in February 1879.

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXVI, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXVII, p. 141.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXVII, p. 169.



Legal problems dragged on and it was not until June 1877 that Ruskin was able to make this satisfactory report to his *Fors* readers :

At last our legal position is, I think, also secure. Our solicitors have been instructed by Mr. Barber to apply to the Board of Trade for a licence under sec. 23 of the " Companies Act, 1867 ". The conditions of licence stated in that section appear to have been drawn up precisely for the convenience of the St. George's Company, and the terms of it are clearer than any I have yet been able to draw up myself.

. . . There will not, in the opinion of our lawyers, be any difficulty in obtaining the sanction of the Board of Trade under this Act ; but I remain myself prepared for the occurrence of new points of formal difficulty ; and must still and always pray the Companions to remember that the real strength of the Society is in its resolved and vital unity ; not in the limits of its external form.<sup>1</sup>

Even so, this happy announcement did not ease the load of Guild work and responsibilities which Ruskin since the resignation of his trustees had carried. In July, he commented, on a necessary change that had to be made in the title of the society :

The first of the formal points of difficulty which, last month, I said I should be prepared to meet, turns out to be one of nomenclature. Since we take no dividend, we cannot be registered as a " Company ", but only a " Society "—" Institute "—" Chamber ", or the like.

I accept this legal difficulty as one appointed by *Fors* herself ; and submit to the measures necessitated by it even with satisfaction ; having for some time felt that the title of " Company " was becoming every day more and more disgraceful, and could not much longer be attached to any association of honourable Englishmen.<sup>2</sup>

The society was duly registered as the Guild of St. George. In August, he made further comment on his difficulties :

I regret that the Abbey Dale property still stands in my name ; but our solicitors have not yet replied to my letter requesting them to appoint new Trustees ; and I hope that the registration of the Guild may soon enable me to transfer the property at once to the society as a body.<sup>3</sup>

In September he wrote cheerfully in the notes and correspondence section of Letter LXXXII under the sub-title *Affairs of the Master* :

Too many for him : and it is quite certain he can't continue to ride so many horses at once, or keep so many balls in the air. All that he thinks it needful, in this *Fors*, to say, is that, whatever he may cease hope of doing, he will not fail from St. George's work, as long as he has strength for any work at all.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXIX, p. 205.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXX, p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXXI, p. 269.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXXII, p. 328.

Even as late as 1878, the matter was still unsettled and his administration of Guild affairs was correspondingly wearisome and trying; he wrote in 1880 in the first *Fors* letter in the Second Series under the Company's Affairs:

I never was less able to give any account of these, for the last month has been entirely occupied with work in Oxford; the Bank accounts cannot be in my hands till the year's end; the business at Abbeydale can in no wise be put on clear footing till our Guild is registered; and I have just been warned of some further modifications needful in our memorandum for registry.<sup>1</sup>

and he added:

But I was completely convinced last year that, fit or unfit, I must take all these things in hand myself; and I do not think the leading article of our Correspondence will remain after the present month so wholly unsatisfactory.<sup>2</sup>

Not until February 1878 was he able to report ultimate success in the long, exhausting struggle to secure legal recognition for his company:

I am happy to be able at last to state that the memorandum of our constitution, drawn up for us by Mr. Barber, and already published in the 55th number of the first series of *Fors*, has been approved by the Board of Trade, with some few, but imperative, modifications, to which I both respectfully and gladly submit, seeing them to be calculated in every way to increase both our own usefulness, and public confidence in us.

The organization of the Guild, thus modified, will be, by the time this letter is published, announced, as required by the Board, in the public journals; and, if not objected to on the ground of some unforeseen injuriousness to existing interests, ratified, I believe, during the current month, or at all events within a few weeks. I have prepared a brief abstract of our constitution and aims, to be issued with this letter, and sent generally in answer to inquiry.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless he was still not free to transfer property and appropriate monies to the Guild and he wrote:

Until the registration of the Guild, I am still obliged to hold the Abbey Dale estate in my own name; and as we cannot appoint our new trustees till we are sure of our official existence, I am obliged to order the payment of subscriptions to my own account at the Union Bank, to meet the calls of current expenses, for which I have no authority to draw on the account of the Guild but by cheque from its trustees.<sup>4</sup>

The difficulties proved greater than his strength and the *Fors* letter following the announcement of his success carried a pathetic publishers' note reporting his serious illness "from

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VIII, I, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

prostration caused by overwork " and his inability until further notice to issue *Fors*.

It is true to say that Ruskin spent himself trying to overcome legal difficulties. He himself accounted for his breakdown—in the first *Fors* letter to be published after his illness :

The doctors said that I went mad, this time two years ago, from overwork. I had not been then working more than usual, and what was usual with me had become easy. But I went mad because nothing came of my work. People would have understood my falling crazy if they had heard that the manuscripts on which I had spent seven years of my old life had all been used to light the fire with, like Carlyle's first volume of the French Revolution. But they could not understand that I should be the least annoyed, far less fall ill in a frantic manner, because, after I had got them published, nobody believed a word of them. Yet the first calamity would only have been a misfortune,—the second (the enduring calamity under which I toil) is humiliation,—resisted necessarily by a dangerous and lonely pride.<sup>1</sup>

And he laid the blame for his sorrow and illness on the great solitude he experienced :

All alike, in whom I had most trusted for help, failed me in this main work : some mocked at it, some pitied, some rebuked,—all stopped their ears at the cry : and the solitude at last became too great to be endured.<sup>2</sup>

In the Spring of 1878, on Easter Monday, he sent a note to Mrs. Talbot which showed his attitude of mind towards his Guild of St. George at this time of great physical weakness :

I believe for the last few days I have been gaining ground and may at least begin to rectify the confusion of business which had just reached its uttermost when I was struck down—so very nearly *under* the ground—and beyond all farther gain a loss of it—or of anything thereon. But the only hope I have of being able to do so, is in the consent of my friends to regard me for the future—so far from a " master "—as in the most literal sense—their " most obedient Servant " can be and telling me what I can *quickly* do to extricate them from inconvenience in the present state of the St. G. affairs.<sup>3</sup>

He recoiled from the whirling Guild questions that encompassed him and wrote again on 8 May 1878 to declare firmly :

But above all, I must not be talked to or questioned about St. George, till my own time. I hope to do good work for him yet, but till I *call* them my St. George people must at present get on exactly as if I were dead.<sup>4</sup>

He was too weary to see the road that in 1871 seemed to lie so clearly ahead. He experienced in convalescence an excessive

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VIII, IV, p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/66. Easter Monday, 1878.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1161/67. 8.5.78.

weariness of Guild affairs with its unresolved land questions and halting companions, many of whom sought to please him but had no real understanding of the ideas he set before them. He came to rely more and more on George Baker to whom he frequently, in private correspondence, expressed his desire to be free from wearying Guild worries and responsibilities.

The first meeting of the Guild of St. George took place on 21 February 1879; unfortunately Ruskin was unable to be present, but extracts from his letter to George Baker, who deputized for him, were read to the twenty assembled companions who met at Queen's Hotel, Birmingham. Howard Swan, the Curator of Sheffield Museum, read the Master's report which touched on educational rather than agricultural aspects of the Guild's work, and indicated Ruskin's intention to devote such of his time as was available to "method of school instruction and especially the arrangement of the Museum of the Guild". He made interesting comment on the Guild's legal position and, for reasons of health, delegated his authority on legal and land affairs to the Trustees. These were his words :

It is at present a peculiarity of British law that while, for any selfish purpose, a company may acquire without difficulty, or dispute, any lands they desire, the acquisition of land for any benevolent purpose is discouraged and encumbered with legal forms which render the operation of the Guild at present extremely complex. The state of the present Master's health entirely precludes him from undertaking duties which require vexatious and minutely divided attention; and he therefore begs that all legal powers for acquisition and management of lands may be vested in the Trustees only.<sup>1</sup>

He added the following pointed reminder :

The Master to his great regret, must also beg the members of the Guild to remember that his knowledge does not qualify him, nor do the nature of his general occupations permit him, to undertake the personal direction of any farming operations, or management of any of the retainers of the Guild, in residence on their lands. Nor was it ever proposed by him, in the constitution of the Guild, that such duties should be entrusted to its Head. The Master's office consists only in the maintenance of the principles of the Guild inviolate, on occasions when any question of their extent or force may present themselves, and in directing or authorising the employment of its resources in any particular manner, but not in the superintendence of the carrying out of such orders. For instance, the Master may authorise expenditure in draining a fen, or in enclosing a piece of sea sand; but is not to be expected to survey the fall of the channels, or

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 18.



design the foundations of the embankment. The existing Master, however, supposing himself qualified to direct usefully the method of school instruction, and especially the arrangement of the museums of the Guild, has set himself, with what time he can spare, to carry out these objects ; and he trusts that the expense, which with this view he has permitted in the establishment of the Museum at Sheffield, may not be considered unjustifiable.<sup>1</sup>

At the Extraordinary General Meeting, which immediately followed the reading of this report, the following resolution was passed :

That it shall be lawful for the Guild, in General Meeting to appoint any fit and proper person or persons to be Trustee or Trustees or Treasurer of the Guild, for such purposes and with such powers as the Guild, in General Meeting, shall from time to time appoint and to revoke any such appointment and re-appointment in like manner.<sup>2</sup>

It is a curious fact that in the Memorandum originally published and approved, the office of Trustee was omitted. It may well be that Ruskin was advised by his solicitors, Tarrant and Mackrell, not to include such office in his Society, but he obviously regretted the decision. This, and another resolution concerning salaries of auditors and others, were confirmed at a later meeting held on 18 March and once more Ruskin, who at the time was at work on a new Edition of *The Stones of Venice*, asked Baker to delegate for him, and sent the following note to him the day before the meeting took place :

Meantime all you have to say to the Guild people is that it's not me that's bothering them, but English law and lawyers, and whatever we do of real work will not depend on anything that these can hinder, but on our severally understanding each in his own place, what he can best labour at under his own hand and for his own neighbour. And that they need no more look to the mortal master for help, than the leaves of a great tree look to the first pith of it (though I dare say the old pith is good for more than I am).<sup>3</sup>

Ruskin was made constantly weary by the stupidity of some of his Companions ; it is obvious that he found physically exhausting the ever-questioning companions who sought his advice. In his General Statement of 1882 he gave public reminder of this :

I went to look at all the cottages myself : and in general the Master of the Guild would hold annual visits to the estates, within his reach, part of his necessary duty. I am now, however, entirely past work of this kind—nor was it one for

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George).

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 303.

which I was fitted ; still less, must it be said in passing, should the Companions suppose that I am myself able, or that the Master under any circumstances would be able, to become the confidant of their private feelings or distresses, as if he were the Abbot of a monastery. The drainage of land he may sometimes superintend, but not that of spirits.<sup>1</sup>

He spoke more openly to George Baker in a letter written on 17 March 1879 :

Poor Mr. . . . 's [name cut out] letter makes me sad. We have too many of our people of this sort who only want to talk or be talked to—The Fors correspondence was far the most laborious part of the number—and not of the slightest use, really. Nor is there the least need for more than I've said—when once the British public begin to see that it is true. What we want now is the help of men of common sense—standing and perseverance—who will think only of what is to be done—not said.<sup>2</sup>

It must have been a great relief to Ruskin when at last Baker and F. H. Chamberlain were elected Trustees. By a special resolution they were empowered to pay out funds, and also to raise out of the capital trust funds any amounts of money stated by the Master. No longer did they hold the position of financial advisers, they were virtually his assistants. At the end of 1879 Ruskin wrote as follows to Baker :

I have your kind letter with cheque, and return receipts account with best thanks,—and as you may well suppose—true reflection to you of your kind wishes for the year to come.

I heartily trust that you will not regret having helped me at this time and set all things in practical order—the new Fors will not cost me much trouble—its chief purpose being to make known this pleasant condition of things. Nor will the duty of the Trusteeship be onerous to you and Mr. Chamberlain. You say I have given no general directions—but there are no general responsibilities. The Trustees are simply the legal holders of [passage cut.? the St. George's fund and] certify the correctness of the Master's statements as to its amount and expenditure. You ought not to have any trouble with the accounts, which are properly the Master's business : but, in the present state of my health, I trespass on you so far as to ask you to get the accountant's statement into short form for me there is really nothing else now to be done. You have to receive estates—when I buy them—and to sell stock or buy it as occasion may be—nothing more.

Your own kind superintendence of the ground you gave me of course is an exceptional favour. I should be very glad that Graham had an assistant. He wrote to me about it some time since, but I have been in an extraordinary state of weariness since I left London, and could not write about it, day after day passing, in intentions [valediction and signature cut off].<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George). 17.3.79.

<sup>3</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George). n.d.

Another attack of brain fever lasting three months made him, on recovery, more anxious than ever to withdraw from Guild activities as this letter to George Baker shows :

Brantwood,

Sunday 20th March, 1881.

So I am told. But I have been dreaming much and have lost all count of time.

Dear Mr Baker,

I have had another sharp attack of brain fever—nothing like so severe as the first one but giving me final warning to resign the position of Mastership of St. George's Company.

Put yourself and Mr Chamberlain at once in communication with Messrs Tarrant and Mackrell through whom you may receive directions from the original members of the Company—mostly girls. I myself must confine my work to Proserpina and general art work. Mr Allen must give up the publishing business and take to his engraving. Answer this *to myself* care of Mrs Severn—take copies of all my letters henceforward—you must wind up the affairs of the Company at once—so that I may come out of it with clean hands and a pure heart—though I may have to beg like Auld Edie Ochiltree. I have *three* thousand not *twelve* now in stocks and the Society of the Rose must henceforward deal with Fors Clavigera to which I shall add no word more.

Ever your faithful and affectionate servant,

J. Ruskin <sup>1</sup>

A second letter (18 April 1881) gave further details about his wishes on this matter :

But, my first letter after my illness was quite serious—I *must* quit myself of these responsibilities. When Mr Mackrell called—instead of relieving me, he was fain to go into questions about " what would become of the twenty acres at Bewdley " etc, which I could no more settle than the affairs of Afganhistān!—on deliberate review of my ten years' results, I feel that nothing more can be done by me against the rage of modern trade ; and I want to " shake the dust off my feet at it "—and to sell all the Sheffield land at Totley—and to give you back the land at Bewdley—and Mrs Talbot hers at Barmouth and use what we have in the bank and what regular subscriptions come in for the one thing I *can* do now—the Museum arrangement at Walkley.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the year he made reference in his report of 1881 to his severe illness and to his wish to retire :

The attacks of severe illness which I have lately sustained render me sincerely desirous of retiring from the office, but until the permission to do so is granted me, I maintain the structure of the Company as I have established it.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George). 20.3.81.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 18.4.81.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 32.

Again the burden of the Report turned on his Museum work and his proposed heavy expenditure but he wrote confidently of the future :

. . . I believe the general public will not be slack in aiding us, for an object of so much real and unquestionable public service as the liberal education of the artisan.<sup>1</sup>

He was convinced that this educational object would receive public support and he concluded his report with these words :

Whatever has been thought by my casual readers of the tenor of my teaching in political or economical questions, I do not think the principles of education which I have recommended from first to last have ever been otherwise than approved as rational, simple, and easily applicable, while the knowledge which I have obtained in the arts and elementary sciences, during the secluded labour of a mercifully prolonged lifetime, can only now be made serviceable to my country on the condition of its supplying me with funds for the support of educational institutions whose design, as surely enough proved by that with which I have begun at Sheffield, will be on no extravagant scale either in building, furniture, or officering ; and will enlarge only in the gradual demonstration of their usefulness to the most active and intelligent classes of our labouring population.<sup>2</sup>

In 1882, Ruskin launched what was virtually a public appeal for his Guild with his publication of a pamphlet entitled "General Statement explaining the Nature and Purpose of St. George's Guild". In it he restated his aims and expressed the belief that if he had cast all other work aside and devoted his whole time and energy to Guild work the Society would have prospered. To win new members he intimated his decision to abandon the requirements of a tithe from Companions and proposed instead :

to accept any person as Companion, who, complying with our modes of action and consenting in our principles, will contribute one per cent of their income, up to ten pounds on incomes reaching a thousand a year, on the understanding that, above that sum, no more shall be asked.<sup>3</sup>

He stated his willingness to accept contributions from strangers who were invited to support any branch of activity which most interested them. The four principle activities named were : agricultural labour, historical investigation and illustration, completion of mineralogical collection of St. George's Museum, and purchase of manuscripts and other objects of general

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 39.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 47.



interest for St. George's Museum. In connection with this last activity, he reminded his readers of his lifelong interest in Museums and he gave detailed information about his proposed development at Sheffield. This General Statement ended with a strong appeal for funds for the purchase of manuscripts shortly to be sold in the Hamilton Palace Library sale on which he made this comment :

I think the English public ought to have confidence enough in my knowledge of Art and History to trust me with a considerable sum for this purpose.<sup>1</sup>

Clearly, it was Ruskin's museum enterprise which gave him his new confidence. He reminded his readers where their duty lay and wrote :

the founding of museums adapted for the general instruction and pleasure of the multitude, and especially the labouring multitude, seems to be in these days a farther necessity, to meet which the people themselves may be frankly called upon, and to supply which their own power is perfectly adequate, without waiting the accident or caprice of private philanthropy.<sup>2</sup>

To make his argument the stronger he presented the case that an educational establishment for the young was of greater importance than a church to a clergyman. He wrote :

I continually see subscriptions of ten, fifteen or twenty thousand pounds, for new churches. Now a good clergyman never wants a church. He can say all that his congregation essentially need to hear in any of his parishioners' best parlours, or upper chambers, or in the ball-room at the Nag's Head ; or if these are not large enough, in the market-place, or the harvest field.<sup>3</sup>

But the appeal won response only from Mrs. Talbot and so the rare manuscripts offered at Hamilton Palace Library went to other buyers and not to the Guild of St. George.

The following year Ruskin resumed publication of his *Fors* letters which reflected a more tranquil state of mind than heretofore. The following letter to his Trustee, George Baker, written on the death of co-trustee Chamberlain gives a picture of Ruskin's life at this time :

Brantwood,  
7th December 83

Dear Mr Baker,

I am so very glad you have been at Sheffield and so kindly arranged everything for me there—and I have written to Messrs Tarrant and Mackrell, to be all ready for Monday.

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx, 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 52.

In all business matters please remember that on receiving a letter *unexpectedly* about anything, however important, I may be simply unable to even read it for a day or two—much more to think of it. All my work is done and can only be done, one thing, or one group of [? intended] things at a time. If I get a business letter while I am watching a cloud from four in the afternoon to four in the morning, what can I do? (See my last Oxford lecture when it comes out.)

In general, I open all letters, glance at them, and if a house is on fire may answer—but for the most part only get a vague notion of their contents. But when once I have written explicit directions about anything—I trust to their being followed out, and am thrown out of all gear, if they are not. In this case I had sent warning from Lucca in 1882 and advised you of probable expenses to be kept provided for out of the Bennett bequest; and when your letters came about it—I recollect glancing at total sum and saying to myself—that's in, all right—but never looked to see *what* stock was bought or what cash over.

I sold 500 myself to be able to fulfil promises, on Wednesday, and I hope the cash is in bank this morning, but I don't want to break into it the first minute and should be very grateful if you would send, tomorrow, £50 to Miss Caroline Leech, Belvedere Belmont, Dyke Road, Brighton, putting it down in Trustees account 'to drawings by John Leech bought for Sheffield Museum' you won't mind advancing so much?

And note, when you sell out, that besides the sums stated in my last account there will be £150 to Bryce Wright for the largest topaz in matrix and largest Ural emerald, sent to Sheffield last month.

Ever affectionately and faithfully yours

J. Ruskin

Alas, Mr Smart won't serve. I will try Mr Thompson of Huddersfield.<sup>1</sup>

He succeeded in securing the services of George Thompson of Huddersfield as co-trustee with George Baker.

The only Guildmeeting, which Ruskin ever attended, took place in December 1884, and his presence at this meeting may possibly be accounted for by the fact that one resolution presented and passed concerned the setting up of a Museum at Bewdley. It read:

that Mr. Ruskin be authorized to proceed with work for erection of Museum at Bewdley, under the Master's superintendence, plans and estimates to be prepared before the end of the year.<sup>2</sup>

In his report Ruskin touched on the difficulties that existed between the Sheffield Corporation and himself in the matter of ownership of the Walkley collections. He referred in this report to "insignificant" Guild possessions and added that he could have made greater progress if he had wished to undertake land management on an extensive scale:

<sup>1</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George). 7.12.83.

<sup>2</sup> Ruskin Collection (Guild of St. George).

but as I know very little about land myself, and as the few landowners of my acquaintance were unlikely to render me assistance in exemplifying our principles of land tenure during the present state of political feeling,—(nor do I blame them),—I delayed for the present, and, may probably have to bequeath to the succeeding Master, the prosecution of the objects of the Guild in that direction, though ultimately to be the principal one ; and as I have hitherto used, so in the time during which I may yet be able to conduct the business of the Guild, I shall in all likelihood use the entire means at my disposal for the accumulation of the objects of study which, more than most men, I am qualified to select and arrange.<sup>1</sup>

He explained that Guild expenditure had for the past three years been devoted mainly to the Sheffield Museum and he made this comment on his accounts :

I have not the slightest compunction in presenting these accounts to the Guild, feeling entirely confident of the educational value of every article of the things purchased, so that I may invite persons otherwise uninterested in us, or our plans, to subscribe separately and distinctly to our expenses in these directions.<sup>2</sup>

Ruskin's last report, written with the object of securing wide support for Guild activities, sounded a valedictory note. In it he expressed his regret that in the long fifteen year struggle only two wealthy friends, Mrs. Talbot and George Baker, had come forward to help him. He tried to show that the action taken by his friends to pay his law costs after the Whistler court case, and to make him a gift of Turner's *Splügen* was misguided and he added :

I am very grateful to them, but would very willingly have gone without the *Splügen*, and paid my own law costs, if only they would have helped me in the great public work which I have given certainly the most intense labour of my life to promote.<sup>3</sup>

There was a justifiable bitterness in his words :

I offered to arrange a museum,—and if the means were given me, a series of museums,—for the English people, in which, whether by cast, photograph, or skilled drawing, they should be shown examples of all the most beautiful art of the Christian world. I did enough to show what I meant, and to make its usefulness manifest. I may boldly say that every visitor, of whatever class, to the little Walkley Museum, taking any real interest in art, has acknowledged the interest and value even of the things collected in its single room. And yet year after year passes and not a single reader or friend has thought it the least incumbent on them to help me to do more ; and from the whole continent of America, which pirates all my books, and disgraces me by base copies of the plates of them, I have never had a sixpence sent to help me in anything I wanted to do.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 71.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 95.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 96.

And so he took his stand and gave this advice :

to the numbers of people who write to express their gratitude to me, I have only this one general word,—send your gratitude in the form of pence, or do not trouble me with it ; and to my personal friends, that it seems to me high time their affection should take that form also, as it is the only one by which they can also prove their respect.<sup>1</sup>

Following the intimation of his projected scheme to build a new Museum at Bewdley he reminded the British Public that the continuance of his work was dependent on public subscription. Unfortunately there was no response to his appeal and so Ruskin was forced to dispense with the services of some artists whom he had employed to work for him. A note to Mrs. Talbot written in March 1886, made reference to the Guild's financial difficulties:

Of course Quarry *would* be working for me if I had the money now to carry on the St. G. work. But I've had to turn off Alessandri and Randal, instead of taking any helpers on.<sup>2</sup>

And later in June he wrote again :

I can't play chess today for it has been a great sorrow to me to think that you, who have benefited the St. George's Guild of all my friends the most frankly and grandly should as if by the fierce enemy of all righteousness be shortened in your own income and anxious to know what Quarry could do in painting. He has great and fine power—but he wants certain perceptions, yet and artistic training—He could only do work like Randal's—as yet—and I've been obliged this year, because the public—(nay,—because nobody but you,—almost !) sends me a penny. I've been obliged I say, to turn off both Randal and Alessandri,—keeping, and *that* with difficulty, my best man only, Rooke.

—How can I take Quarry on, whom I should have to direct also in this my busiest time—while the others have been trained for years and years ! ?

Most thankfully I'll take him on—if I get the means,—but I *can't*—till I do.

Supposing—for at any moment of course I *may* get the means,—supposing I could—(I haven't yet opened my this morning's letters—this that I tell you has been on my mind long—) Supposing I could. I should ask him to go immediately to Auxerre where by two hours train—he is within reach of *everything* I want—and to tell me what is at Auxerre. Rooke is at Laon—Quarry could see what *he* is about as he passes. And, I think, that is the best thing to plan for them both, wife as well I mean. I hope some things are left at Auxerre—of which, if Quarry can go there, I will send him word. I give Rooke £50 a month. Randal had £40. If I take Quarry on I could only give him as much.<sup>3</sup>

Unfortunately all plans were brought to a final pause for he was again attacked by brain fever. Over a year elapsed before he

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/291. 17.3.86.

<sup>3</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/360. 27.6.86.



was able to resume correspondence, and then not for long, and never again on Guild matters.

Ruskin succeeded as founder of the Guild of St. George, but the question now to be considered is how far did he succeed as Master?

His first opportunity to show his powers as Master of the Guild, as distinct from founder, came with George Baker's gift of land in Bewdley. This gift, it will be remembered, was made in two instalments, a first in 1871 and a second in 1875, but Ruskin made no move either to inspect the land, or to set it in order. When in 1875, he received the second gift from Baker, he wrote in *Fors*, Letter LVIII :

While, therefore, I am perfectly content, for a beginning, with our acre of rocky land given us by Mrs. Talbot, and am so little impatient for any increase that I have been quietly drawing ragged-robin leaves in Malham cove, instead of going to see another twenty acres promised in Worcestershire,—I am yet thinking out my system on a scale which shall be fit for wide European work.<sup>1</sup>

Not until July 1877, did he visit Birmingham—and it is likely that the real purpose of his visit there was not so much to view St. George's Bewdley land, but to settle matters about the appointment of trustees with Baker himself. He wrote of this visit to Birmingham :

I have been staying for two days with the good Mayor of Birmingham : and he has shown me St. George's land, his gift, in the midst of a sweet space of English hill and dale and orchard, yet unhurt by hand of man : and he has brought a representative group of the best men of Birmingham to talk to me, and they have been very kind to me, and have taught me much : and I feel just as I fancy a poor Frenchman of some gentleness and sagacity might have felt, in Nelson's time,—taken prisoner by his mortal enemies, and beginning to apprehend that there was indeed some humanity in Englishmen, and some providential and inscrutable reason for their existence.

You may think it strange that a two days' visit should produce such an effect on me ; and say, (which indeed will be partly true,) that I ought to have made this visit before now. But, all things considered, I believe it has been with exactness, timely ; and you will please remember that just in proportion to the quantity of work and thought we have spent on any subject, is the quantity we can farther learn about it in a little while, and the power with which new facts, or new light cast on those already known, will modify past conclusions. And when the facts are wholly trustworthy, and the lights thrown precisely where one asks for them, a day's talk may sometimes do as much as a year's work.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LVIII, p. 279.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXX, p. 215.

In Letter LXV, published in May 1876, a year before his visit to Bewdley, he reported the first activity there. Under the sub-title *Affairs of the Company* in the Notes and Correspondence section he wrote :

I have given leave to two of our Companions to begin work on the twenty acres of ground in Worcestershire, given us by Mr. George Baker, our second donor of land ; (it was all my fault that he wasn't the first). The ground is in copsewood ; but good for fruit trees ; and shall be cleared and brought into bearing as soon as the two Companions can manage it. We shall now see what we are good for, working as backwoods men, but in our own England.<sup>1</sup>

The next letter, Letter LXVI, dated May 1876 and published in June of that year gave this information in the Notes and Correspondence section :

I am really ashamed to give any farther account, just now, of the delays in our land work, or of little crosses and worries blocking my first attempt at practice. One of the men whom I thought I had ready for this Worcestershire land, being ordered, for trial, to do a little bit of rough work in Yorkshire that I might not torment Mr. Baker with his freshmanship, threw up the task at once, writing me a long letter of which one sentence was enough for me,—that “ he would do *his share*, but no more ”. These infernal notions of Equality and Independence are so rooted, now, even in the best men's minds, that they don't so much as know even what Obedience or Fellowship mean ! Fancy one of Nelson's or Lord Cochrane's men retreating from his gun, with the avowed resolution to ‘ do no more than his share ’ ! However, I know there's good in this man, and I doubt not he will repent, and break down no more ; but I shall not try him again for a year.<sup>2</sup>

It is obvious that Ruskin, despite his anger, regarded Burdon's withdrawal as only a temporary lapse, and it is, of course, as obvious that Ruskin showed little understanding of human nature in his treatment of this Companion who, after all, had given up his regular employment to devote himself to Guild activities. In this incident Ruskin showed that weakness which marred his every human relationship : his inability fully to appreciate the wounding power of words. Nevertheless, Guild accounts for June and August of this same year in which Burdon withdrew from the Bewdley undertaking, show that Ruskin made two payments of five pounds to Burdon and that he also paid to him on 9th November, 1877, a cheque for £20. And so, while Ruskin in the first instance made a serious error in his treatment of an enthusiastic Companion, he at least showed some degree of

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VI, I.XV, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LXVI, p. 182.

responsibility for him by the various payments which he made in an attempt to make amends.

The actual clearing of the land was left entirely to George Baker to make such plans as he wished. Guild accounts for the year 1877 show that Baker received a cheque for £100 for this purpose and his own statement about expenditure incurred reads :

I enclose you Crump's bills and statement, showing amount in hand. The cost of getting out the roots is £67 . 3 . 5., or an average of £13 . 8 . 8. per acre. The rest of the sum expended is £19 . 6 . 3., paid for cleaving and stacking the roots ready for charcoal or fuel. Of this we have 103 cords, worth, at 7s. a cord, £36 . 1 ; and a few poles—say, £3 . 19. Total value in hand £40.

Your loving and faithful friend

Geo. Baker.<sup>1</sup>

The work of clearing the land continued at the Guild's expense. Wages and other expenses for 1881 appear in accounts as £106 7s. 1d. ; £169 for 1882 ; £172 for 1883 ; £122 for 1884. Sale of produce from the estate reached only £31 15s. in 1884. having dropped from £52 3s. in 1883. Ruskin was frankly not interested in this work of clearing the land ; it is obvious from his Guild Reports that he appreciated the beauty of Bewdley more than any thought of reclaiming the land. In 1879, he made this comment :

The second of the estates of the Guild, at Bewdley, is in a beautiful part of England, in which the Master, for his own part, would be well content that it should remain, for the present, in pasture or orchard, a part of the healthy and lovely landscape of which so little remains now undestroyed in the English midlands. But he is well content to leave it at the option of Mr. George Baker, to whose kindness the Guild owes the possession of this ground, to undertake any operations upon it which in his judgment seem desirable for the furtherance of the objects of the Guild.<sup>2</sup>

In his *General Statement* of 1882, in which the Guild's original intention was stated to be the reclaiming of " food-producing land " by " well-applied labour " he made comment on Bewdley, and again referred to its beauty and to his own satisfaction with its native state :

I also much regret having only once been able to visit a piece of ground given us, twenty acres in extent, by our kind Trustee, Mr. George Baker, in one of the loveliest districts of Worcestershire, so precious, in its fresh air and wild woodland,

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 116.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 20.

to the neighbouring populations of large manufacturing towns, that I am content at present in our possession of it, and do not choose to break the quiet of its neighbourhood by any labourer's cottage building, without which, however, I do not at present see my way to any effective use of the ground.<sup>1</sup>

Ruskin valued Bewdley for its beauty, and it was only when negotiations for his Sheffield Museum development plan broke down that he contemplated the idea of disturbing that beauty and building another museum there. On this matter he made the following comment :

But we need immediately, beyond all other needs, a storehouse for our property on our own ground : and I have, therefore, on the final rupture of negotiations at Sheffield, requested Mr. Robson to adapt the design he had prepared for the museum in that town, to this immediate purpose on our ground at Bewdley, where the air is free from smoke and the soil dry.<sup>2</sup>

He gave details about the proposed building and continued with characteristic optimism :

As the site of the building is at a considerable distance even from the town of Bewdley, it is necessary to contemplate also the erection of a sort of cloistral *Inn* of the humblest kind, such as may serve the student, providing him with pleasant lodging and good food on the honestest terms. Let us get the Museum built first—the inn can be ready as soon as it is needed.<sup>3</sup>

Museum and Inn together may sound like castles in Spain, but is the idea so very far removed from principles guiding the establishment of residential colleges for further education? The distinction between Ruskin's vision of a cloistral inn and the average residential college for further education might be said to rest on degrees of comfort. Ruskin's inn was to be of the humblest kind, presumably free from the deep armchairs, thick carpets, curtains and other familiar furnishings of today's college. Further details about the Bewdley Museum were given in December 1884 at the only Guild meeting Ruskin ever attended, when he renewed his appeal for financial support for this purpose. Unfortunately the appeal failed, the Museum consequently was never built, and George Baker continued during the few years of illness with intervals of health that remained to Ruskin, to supervise this plot of ground. It will be noted that it was only when the idea of building a Museum at Bewdley was advanced that Ruskin showed interest in the land.

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 50.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 76.



Before that his attitude towards Bewdley might almost be likened to that of an official of the National Trust—he regarded it for its beauty and for its greenness in an industrial area and he felt that it should rightly be left in peace. Certainly he viewed with a certain amount of consternation the idea of putting up a labourer's cottage in such idyllic surroundings, but then, of course, as has been stated many times, he was not prepared to act as adviser on land policy. George Baker never attempted to wrest advice from him about the land, he appears always to have attempted to relieve Ruskin of any Guild burden that he felt he could carry for him.

The same statement cannot be made of Mrs. Talbot, donor of the Barmouth property and land. She was obviously delighted to have opportunity of approaching Ruskin and she saw to it that none was lost. Although he constantly reminded her that she was in fact responsible for the administration of the property, she never accepted this view. Ruskin received gift of the Barmouth land in 1874 and after visiting it in 1876, he wrote somewhat sentimentally :

I have just been down to Barmouth to see the tenants on the first bit of ground,—noble crystalline rock, I am thankful to say,—possessed by St. George in the island.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless he was alive to the needs of the property which was obviously in a bad state of repair and he wrote in Letter LXIX :

I find the rain coming through roofs, and the wind through walls, more than I think proper, and have ordered repairs ; and for some time to come, the little rents of these cottages will be spent entirely in the bettering of them, or in extending some garden ground, fenced with furze hedge against the west wind by the most ingenious of our tenants.<sup>2</sup>

On this visit Ruskin was delighted to meet Auguste Guyard, the exiled French social reformer and philanthropist to whom the Talbots had given shelter on their Barmouth property. Guyard loved the Barmouth land, cared for it, knew its natural outcrop and cultivated rare herbs and trees there. His work for Barmouth came near to approaching Ruskin's early plans for the care and cultivation of St. George's land. The two men had natural sympathy for each other. Blanche Atkinson, a Companion of the Guild and also, as the Rylands Ruskin manuscripts show, an

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VI, LXIX, p. 275.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

enthusiastic correspondent, records in her account of *Ruskin's Social Experiment at Barmouth* that he made the following statement to Guyard :

These things which I am but now discovering and trying to teach, *you* knew and taught when I was a child.<sup>1</sup>

Of Guyard's death in 1882 Ruskin wrote in a letter to Mrs. Talbot dated 12 September :

I found your sad letter waiting with others of importance at Bourneville which I had given as a safe address—but far ahead of my progress on the journey.

I lose in M. Guyard a friend of more value to me than any words could say, his spiritual character—total probity—refined affectionateness and broken fate in life were all of the profoundest interest to me ; his sympathy was among the most precious pleasures yet left to me in my own work.<sup>2</sup>

Ruskin, harried by ill health and overwork, never came to love the Barmouth land as Guyard loved it—and yet his hopes were high in August 1877, as this postcard to Mrs. Talbot shows :

I wish every rock in England were as well looked after as *our* Rock will be.<sup>3</sup>

In his Report of 1879 he made the following comment on the estate :

The Barmouth estate consists chiefly of rocky ground, in the shelter of which are erected a few ill-built cottages. The rents of these are for the most part at present spent in bettering the sanitary condition of the place and its tenements ; but the Master has no intention of allowing so many ultimately to remain on the ground, and as the leases fall in, the poorer cottages will be removed, and the ground brought into such other use as may be possible. One of the tenants has already changed the crannies of his rocky garden into little beds of vegetables, protected by stout furze hedges ; and under the kind supervision of the former owner of the land, Mrs. Talbot, the Master is sure that the best is being everywhere now done of which the place is capable.<sup>4</sup>

In his General Statement of 1882, Ruskin again described Barmouth as “ a piece of rocky land ” and reported on the Guild's activities there :

This piece of crag, falling steep from the moors to the shore, had some small tenements in the nooks of it, of which the rents have been taken without alteration, and applied to sanitary improvements, such as were feasible, without disturbance of the inmates. I went to look at all the cottages myself : and in general the Master of the Guild would hold annual visits to the estates, within his reach,

<sup>1</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1164/40, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 1161/88. 12.9.82.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1161/52. 17.8.77

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 21.

part of his necessary duty. I am now, however, entirely past work of this kind—nor was it one for which I was fitted.<sup>1</sup>

He never failed to give emphasis to the fact that he accepted no responsibility so far as the land policy of the Guild was concerned. His Report for 1884 showed that he regarded the property and land owned by the Guild as “insignificant possessions”, and it is possible that it was in the matter of rent only that he exerted influence in this sphere of work. Barmouth rents were low, ranging from 30s. to £5 a year and Ruskin laid great emphasis on the need for tenants to be trained to pay their rents punctually. Blanche Atkinson’s pamphlet on the Barmouth experiment makes clear the fact that Ruskin exercised only remote control there, and that responsibility lay with Mrs. Talbot who endeavoured to give practical application to his theories—generally after correspondence and consultation with him, at times to his intense annoyance. It is obvious from Blanche Atkinson’s account that the punctual payment of rent was a matter of paramount importance. She cited the case of a tenant who was dismissed by reason of her unpunctuality in rent payment, but she also made reference to a case where a financially embarrassed, widowed tenant was allowed a rent free year. It is evident that Ruskin was consulted on the matter for she wrote :

Mr. Ruskin took the case into his serious consideration and, after consulting with Mrs. Talbot, decided that the widow should be allowed to stay in her cottage rent free for one year.<sup>2</sup>

Letters written by Ruskin to Mrs. Talbot show the way in which the Barmouth property was administered : Mrs. Talbot arranged for repairs (obviously deciding which were necessary) and then she received a cheque from Ruskin to meet the cost. For instance, in February 1877, he forwarded a cheque to her for £80 12s. and wrote :

You would have had this cheque long ago, disorderly as I am—if you were not the dear sort of person of whom one says—“Oh—Mrs. Talbot will put up with anything.”

Howbeit—I am much excited & much wearied with my work here—and to take out my business book is a mighty effort to me.

Howbeit, I did want, in sending my cheque, with always gratefullest thanks to ask about these local board rates—income, & land tax in all £16 . 7 . 5.—or

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1164 . 40, p. 23.

thereabouts—we are not charged this yearly are we—oh these poor people—forgive my dullness but I make so many blunders in Fors, I want to be as clear as I can in what statement I now make.

And now—so many thanks for all your kindness in that gift of minerals, and your pretty way of doing it.<sup>1</sup>

Some months later he wrote in answer to her question about appointing a rent collector :

Please appoint the person you think well of to take the rents for me.—I am sure you will choose well—and tell Garibaldi that indeed I wish I could buy his cottage—but *I* have no more money and must not spend St. George's money in buying cottages but only land. And that I'll try to write more simply, every day.<sup>2</sup>

By his joking reference to " Garibaldi " Ruskin sent a message to an old Barmouth inhabitant and his comment on cottage-purchasing gives clear indication that the Master of the Guild did not relish the idea of being land-lord so much as land-owner. He may of course have been dismayed at the bad condition of the property and some of its attendant difficulties—there was at least *one* difficult tenant as this extract from his letter shows :

The objectionable woman must be got rid of, please and the wise one put in, at the rent she can pay, and the wretched cottage pulled down.<sup>3</sup>

He gave Mrs. Talbot some advice about the treatment of needy tenants :

Yes, by all means remit rents wherever it would be distressful—explaining that we only take it to keep their houses in repair and do what is otherwise helpful to them.<sup>4</sup>

Repairs to Barmouth property made quite heavy inroads on Guild capital. Furthermore, Ruskin at work in Geneva in 1882 was devastated to learn that the sanitary commissioners had condemned some of the cottages. He wrote in horror to Mrs. Talbot :

I did not calculate on the interference of Sanitary Commissioners ; and in future, would much rather knock the cottages down altogether than pay for improvements under other people's order. Please therefore clear away the dilapidated cottage and let the others on any terms you yourself judge best (temporarily or continuously,) forbidding always the establishment of any sort of machinery ; or dirt producing manufacture.<sup>5</sup>

It is curious that Ruskin, infuriated as he must have been by the action of the sanitary authorities, yet left the decision to Mrs.

<sup>1</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/40. 2.2.77.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1161/51. 13.7.77.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 1161/53. n.d.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 1161/273. 24.2.86.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 1161/89. 15.9.82.



Talbot to sell, repair or knock down the cottages. In answer to Mrs. Talbot's query about his decision in this matter he wrote :

I have your most kind letters ; and can only leave the cottages—to be sold—or repaired as you think best for the effects in the neighbourhood of the example—whether in kindness, or in sanitary change—I am simply unable to judge, unless I was on the spot.<sup>1</sup>

But poor Mrs. Talbot felt unable to take so decisive a step alone, and so she wrote again for advice, reporting the estimated cost of repairs and received the reply :

My last letter *was* intended to be conclusive in leaving the question in your hands and I am quite content with the estimate you give me of £135.<sup>2</sup>

This figure does not appear in Guild accounts given in *Fors* for the period January to December 1882, but the Barmouth account records :

Rents	£ 48 1 4
Gift from Mrs. Talbot towards new buildings	69 6 0
	<hr/>
	£117 7 4
<i>Less</i>	
Repairs, rates etc.	£ 42 2 2
On account of new buildings	75 5 2
	<hr/>
	£117 7 4 <sup>3</sup>
	<hr/>

As late as 1886, Mrs. Talbot was still seeking his approval for her actions and she received this answer from Ruskin :

Yes of course I should like things sold in Barmouth—but my head and heart are deep in the dead things of long ago—and simply *cannot* think more than they are thinking. There's more in a single year of my real life than I could tell in all that's left of my three volumes—and I'm terrified every evening lest I should not sleep, and every morning—lest I fall sick before sunset.

The chess amuses and relieves me—but *business*—you must do as if I were dead.<sup>4</sup>

And we must imagine that she ceased to harry him and allowed him to relax over their chess games by post.

<sup>1</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/90. Michaelmas Day, 1882.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1161/91. 7.11.82.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 144.

<sup>4</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/313. n.d.

The land gifted to the Guild of St. George therefore, was administered by its donors and not by the Master of the Guild. Ruskin was more directly concerned with the administration of Abbeydale which must be described as the Guild's biggest failure. It will be recollected that the request for a plot of land for allotments made by the Sheffield working men, came at a time when Ruskin was hard at work in Venice. His order that Abbeydale be purchased caused the resignation of his disapproving trustees which in turn cast all Guild business and responsibilities fully on to Ruskin at a time when he had neither time, energy, health, nor inclination to devote himself either to the workmen or to Guild affairs. After intimating his purchase in *Fors*, Letter LXXVI he added :

I have no knowledge yet of the men's plan in detail ; nor, as I have said in the text, shall I much interfere with them, until I see how they develop themselves.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that Ruskin regarded the actual purchase of the land as his responsibility, and, in his mind, care of the land automatically became the workmen's responsibility. He reminded them :

You have this land given you for your work that you may do the best you can for all men ; you are bound by certain laws of work, that the " best you can " may indeed be good and exemplary ; and although I shall endeavour to persuade you to accept nearly every law of the old guilds, that acceptance, I trust, will be with deeper understanding of the wide purposes of so narrow fellowship and, (if the thought is not too foreign to your present temper) more in the spirit of a body of monks gathered for missionary service, than of a body of tradesmen gathered for the promotion even of the honestest and fullest trade.

It is indeed because I have seen you to be capable of co-operation, and to have conceived among yourselves the necessity of severe laws for its better enforcement, that I have determined to make the first essay of St. George's work at Sheffield.<sup>2</sup>

Their gratitude at this opportunity which he gave them angered him, and he wrote in *Fors*, Letter LXXIX :

When I wrote privately to one of your representatives, the other day, that Abbeydale was to be yielded to your occupation rent-free, you received the announcement with natural, but, I must now tell you, with thoughtless, gratitude. I ask you no rent for this land, precisely as a captain of a ship of the line asks no rent for her deck, cleared for action. You are called into a Christian ship of war ;—not hiring a corsair's hull, to go forth and rob on the high seas. And you will find the engagements you have made only tenable by a continual reference to the cause for which you are contending,—not to the advantage you hope to reap.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXVI, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXIX, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183.

Apart from these few rules, he left them alone :

You will have only to consider, each day, how much, with an earnest day's labour, you can produce, of any useful things you are able to manufacture. These you are to sell at absolutely fixed prices, for ready money only ; and whatever stock remains unsold at the end of the year, over and above the due store for the next, you are to give away, through such officers of distribution as the society shall appoint.<sup>1</sup>

Hint of Ruskin's awareness of difficulties at Abbeydale was given in the notes and correspondence section of Letter LXXXI when he wrote :

I ought, by rights, as the Guild's *master*, to be at present in Abbey Dale itself ; but as the Guild's *founder*, I have quite other duties.<sup>2</sup>

In the November *Fors*, Letter LXXXIII, he wrote :

. . . I have been greatly concerned by the difficulties which naturally present themselves in the first organisation of work at Abbey Dale,—the more that these are for the most part attributable to very little and very ridiculous things, which, with all my frankness, I see no good in publishing. The root of all mischief is of course that the Master is out of the way, and the men, in his absence, tried at first to get on by vote of the majority ;—it is at any rate to be counted as no small success that they have entirely convinced themselves of the impossibility of getting on in that popular manner ; and that they will be glad to see me when I can get there.<sup>3</sup>

In January 1878, Ruskin explained in the first letter of the new *Fors* Series that until the Guild was officially registered no real progress could be made at Abbeydale nor could things be set in order there.

The year following, in his Report of 1879, Ruskin, abandoning the picturesque title of "Abbeydale", described the property as :

The Mickley Estate, consisting of about thirteen acres of land at Mickley, in the parish of Dronfield, in the County of Derby, with dwelling-houses, barns, stable, cow-houses, and out-building.

and went on to state the action he had so far taken :

The Master has for the present placed it under the superintendence of his own head gardener, Mr. David Downs, on whose zeal and honesty he can rely, this superintendence being at present given without expense to the Guild. But the gardens will it is hoped, soon become important enough to require the establishment of a Curatorship in connection with them.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXIX, p. 184.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXXIII, p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, LXXXI, p. 269.

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 21.

The object was to show :

the best methods of managing fruit-trees in the climate of northern England, with attached green-houses and botanic garden for the orderly display of all interesting European plants.<sup>1</sup>

That object, however, had to be modified and the hope expressed for Abbeydale in Ruskin's Report for 1881 was modest enough :

On the land at Totley I can only say that its superintendent, Mr. Downs, has been doing all that could be done under the conditions of such climate, and lately severe seasons, wholly unprecedented in my time and his (and we are both now growing old together). I find, however, that *he* troubles himself too much with the usual farmer's questions of market price ; when the land has once been got into good heart, its produce shall be kept at a fixed low price, for the markets of the poor.<sup>2</sup>

Expenditure in 1880 amounted to £100 and in 1881 to £134 14s. 6d.

In his *General Statement* of 1882, Ruskin presented the Abbeydale history in different language :

In order to try the present conditions of fruit and vegetable supply to large towns, I authorised the purchase for the Guild of a plot of thirteen acres, within six miles of Sheffield, which came very completely under the head of "waste land", having been first exhausted and then neglected by former proprietors. Of course, in the first years, nothing but outlay is to be recorded of this acquisition, and the recent severe winters have retarded prospect of better things ; but the land is now fairly brought into heart, and will supply good fruit (strawberries, currants, and gooseberries) to the Sheffield markets at a price both moderate and fixed. I have further the intention of putting some part of the ground under glass, and of cultivating, for botanical study, any beautiful plants which may in their tropical forms illustrate the operation of climate in our own familiar English species. For this special purpose I should be glad to receive subscriptions from any persons interested in botanical education : all such specially intended contributions should be sent to Mr. Henry Swan, Curator of the St. George's Museum in Sheffield.<sup>3</sup>

The plan failed, no subscriptions were received and the 1884 Report made mention of "The Mickley Estate" and its "thirteen acres of very poor land in Derbyshire".

Schemes failed, depression grew, and at length the land was let to a tenant to farm. Responsibility for this failure must fall on Ruskin for he made the purchase. Obviously it was a bad purchase, and the men for whom the land was bought were, of course, unfamiliar with land toil and therefore likely to become

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 49.



frustrated by it. This was a danger which Ruskin foresaw, and when the danger became an eventuality he took action, and handed the plot over to his own gardener's superintendence. Together they worked valiantly, but Ruskin came to realize his mistake for he wrote to Downs in the Spring of 1881 :

Suppose we sell all that good-for-nothing land at Tottley, and take somebody else in, for once—if we can—instead of being always taken in ourselves, for a change?<sup>1</sup>

It is to his credit that for a number of years they still attempted to cultivate the plot. Nevertheless, if the result of this labour was weak, the intention was a brave and generous one : to bring those who toil at mechanical labour in cities out into light and fresh air.

Ruskin's second purchase of land was made at Cloughton near Scarborough where he bought a plot of land for a Companion named John Guy, who refused to work a steam-driven machine and so was dismissed from Newby Hall, his place of employment. Ruskin appears to have regarded this stand in much the same light as he regarded Plimsoll's in the House of Commons. In *Fors*, Letter LXXVIII, he published in the notes and correspondence section Guy's letters in which he referred to his action, to his re-employment at Scarborough, and to his full determination to 'steer clear of steam'. Impressed by his courage Ruskin commented :

One of our brave and gentle companions, has encouraged me in my own duties, and will, I trust, guide no less than encourage others in theirs.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, he was so much encouraged by Guy's action that in 1877 he purchased for £80 a plot of land for him to work on Cloughton Moor. Like Abbeydale, the plot obviously was difficult to work. A second letter from Guy, published in the notes and correspondence section of Letter I New Series, made some report on his work there :

We are clearing, and intend closing, about sixteen hundred yards of what we think the most suitable and best land for a garden, and shall plant a few currant and gooseberry bushes in, I hope directly, if the weather keeps favourable.<sup>3</sup>

He ended his letter with a statement which suggested that he was yet another of those companions who were members for Ruskin's sake rather than for faith in his ideas. He concluded :

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> *Fors* VII, LXXVIII, p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* VIII, I, p. 19.

We shall try our best to work and make arrangements to suit your views as far as we understand them, and anything you could like us to do, we shall be glad to perform.<sup>1</sup>

It is evident that Guy was waiting to receive instructions and directions—but as evident that Ruskin regarded Guy now merely as a tenant of St. George fully responsible for the holding. He stated in his Report of 1879 :

The Cloughton Estate was bought in order to establish in useful work a member of the Guild, Mr. John Guy, with his wife, whom the Master judged capable of setting an example of practical and patient country economy. He has not been disappointed in them, and the last letter he has received, subjoined to this report, will sufficiently, he believes, justify his satisfaction in these tenants.<sup>2</sup>

While the letter subjoined to the report justified Ruskin's opinion of the Guys as tenants, it also gave clear indication of the increasingly difficult problems which the land presented. The quantity and quality of the soil were poor, the land sloped and the neighbours clearly regarded the task as a waste of time. Ruskin made no further report on the land, but the Trustees' Report for 1883 made reference to the departure of Guy from Cloughton in 1882 and reported that another tenant was at work on the land.

Ruskin's land ventures therefore were fraught with exhausting problems that were never resolved, and the tenants whom he selected for those difficult plots of land purchased at his order proved unequal for the task despite their preliminary enthusiasm. Undoubtedly his greatest achievement in his attempt to translate his ideas into practice was his Museum at Sheffield. The story of the Museum has been told many times and in many places, but in *Fors* Ruskin gives a commentary which is often neglected. The first notice of this great experiment was given in the Notes and Correspondence Section of Letter LVI, when he told of the room at Sheffield that was to be the "germ of a museum arranged first for workers in iron". As if to explain his object more clearly, he appended a letter from a Leeds correspondent, who wrote to ask him how a healthy tendency could be brought about in the adolescent who knew pleasures related only to 'animal passions and lusts'. To this question Ruskin made reply :

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VIII, I, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 21.

Nothing *can* be done, but what I am trying to form this St. George's Company to do.<sup>1</sup>

It is unfortunate that this tremendous undertaking should have been associated in the first instance with bitterness. In his *Fors* letter Ruskin told of the ill feeling that existed between himself and the Sheffield Corporation as a result of his refusal (somewhat outspoken) to accept for his purpose a space offered to him in the existing Sheffield Museum. Letter LX told of his purchase at a cost of £600 of the small house at the top of a high hill on the outskirts of Sheffield that was to be his Museum. He described this undertaking in the following way in his General Statement of 1882 :

The duty of which I am myself best capable, and the consummation of all that hitherto has been endeavoured in my writings.<sup>2</sup>

From that time onwards till his death, Guild funds were principally directed towards museum expenditure.

Ruskin experienced intense pleasure in planning his Museum. At times he wrote in *Fors* about the project almost as if he were a kind of cultural Providence :

Indeed, all the things that Solomon in his wisdom sent his ships to Tarshish for,—gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks,—you shall see in their perfection, and have as much as St. George thinks good for you.<sup>3</sup>

There were no delays in his Museum building, he knew the road and he pursued it steadily. Furthermore, in his appointment of Swan as Curator he showed a surety of touch that was lacking in appointments made, or favours given, in connection with his land ventures or industrial experiments. In Letter LXII he published notice of this appointment :

Our eight thousand Consols giving us £240 a year, I have appointed a Curator to the Sheffield Museum, namely, Mr. Henry Swan, an old pupil of mine in the Working Men's College in London ; and known to me since as an estimable and trustworthy person, with a salary of forty pounds a year, and residence. He is obliged at present to live in the lower rooms of the little house which is to be the nucleus of the museum :—as soon as we can afford it, a curator's house must be built outside of it.<sup>4</sup>

Swan obviously made an excellent curator whom the men trusted and regarded as a kind of club leader. Guild accounts

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* V, LVI, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 51.

<sup>3</sup> *Fors* V, LX, p. 336.

<sup>4</sup> *Fors* VI, LXII, p. 63.

occasionally record the gift of a few shillings to the fund from a working man "per Mr. Swan". An unusual item in the Accounts for the half-year ending 30 June 1878 shows a Christmas gift from Swan of "six women's dresses and one child's dress in blue cloth" at a cost of £5 5s. The relationship established was obviously a happy one and it may be assumed that Ruskin felt that through Swan he was getting nearer to those whom he sought most to help.

He lingered over the problem of displaying exhibits in such a way that they would become interesting to the inexperienced museum visitor. In Letter LXIX, he gave details about the intended display of minerals and promised that each would be displayed :

in its own little cell, on purple, or otherwise fittingly coloured velvet of the best.

and he kept his promise. He was emphatic that beauty of arrangement of exhibits was of vital importance and in *Deucalion* he devoted many pages to this subject. At the same time he showed the wisest understanding of the kind of difficulty the iron workers were likely to experience in trying to look at and see value in some of the exhibits. In the Notes and Correspondence section of Letter LXX he gave detailed information about the cost of some exhibits and wrote :

I am sending in gifts to the men at Sheffield, wealth of various kinds, in small instalments—but in secure forms. Five bits of opal ; the market value of one, just paid to Mr. Wright, of 9 Great Russell Street, £3 ; a beryl, of unusual shape, ditto, £2 ; a group of emeralds, from the mine of the Holy Faith of Bogota, and two pieces of moss gold,—market value £2 . 10s,—just paid to Mr. Tennant. Also, the first volume of the Sheffield Library ; an English Bible of the thirteenth century,—market value £50,—just paid to Mr. Ellis. I tell these prices only to secure the men's attention, because I am not sure what acceptant capacity they have for them. When once they recognise the things themselves to be wealth,—when they can see the opals, know the wonderfulness of the beryl, enjoy the loveliness of the golden fibres, read the illuminations of the Bible page—they will not ask what the cost, nor consider what they can get for them. I don't believe they will think even of lending their Bible out on usury.<sup>1</sup>

He himself gave generously to the Museum and wrote with characteristic self-criticism :

I am a little ashamed of my accounts this time, having bought a missal worth £320 for myself, and only given one worth £50 to Sheffield.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VI, LXX, p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



His great generosity and also the generosity of Mrs. Talbot in this Museum building have record breaking features. Occasionally Mrs. Talbot's generosity was a matter of concern to him for it served to emphasise the apathy of others. He wrote in *Fors*, Letter LXXI :

Another donation, of fifty pounds, by Mrs. Talbot, makes me sadly ashamed of the apathy of all my older friends.<sup>1</sup>

The visit of Prince Leopold to his Museum in 1879 was some reward for all his labour, and, in turn, it brought renewed public interest in his endeavours. During the half hour spent with Ruskin at Walkley, the Prince was shown amongst other things the Verrocchio Madonna, the early printed Bibles, the specimens of English illuminated manuscripts, the minerals and precious stones and the paintings, etchings and photographs of Venice. Ruskin wrote in October happily of this event to Mrs. Talbot :

I really think that at last with the Prince's good help, we are well set up at Sheffield—but I'm sadly tired, now after a week of responsibility and extreme excitement in general ways—for the most part delightful—but too much for me.<sup>2</sup>

In February 1880 she delighted him with yet another gift of money and he wrote :

Your gift—with the assurances of your present prosperity implied by it—comes, you see as a part of these great encouragements—and what do you think I am going to do with at least the half of it ? Buy two Diamonds, one for Sheffield, one for the Westminster boys for whom I am writing a grammar of Crystallography which greatly amuses and interests me myself and which will work into the Bible of Amiens in a way which only you and one or two more of my dearest readers could guess. And of all the crystals I have examined I find good diamonds the most instructive.<sup>3</sup>

Ruskin discovered in the years following his serious illness of 1878 that he was able to relax happily over Museum matters, while ordinary Guild affairs frustrated him. His faith in his proposals for the extension of his Museum reflected his belief that the general public would give him financial support. He imagined that those who refused to support his agricultural ventures would undoubtedly have sympathy with this project with its wide educational purpose. He believed too, that his

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VI, LXXI, p. 361.

<sup>2</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/72. 25.10.79.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1161/79. 7.2.80.

own position in England established him exclusively as the man to lead such a scheme. In Letter IV of the New Series of *Fors*, he made this public promise :

And, in fine, here I am yet for a few years, I trust, at their service—ready to arrange such a museum for their artizans as they have not yet dreamed of ;—not dazzling nor overwhelming, but comfortable, useful, and—in such sort as smoke-cumbered skies may admit,—beautiful ; though not, on the outside, otherwise decorated than with plain and easily worked-slabs of Derbyshire marble, with which I shall face the walls, making the interior a working man's Bodleian Library, with cell and shelf of the most available kind, undisturbed, for his holiday time. The British public are not likely to get such a thing done by anyone else for a time, if they don't get it done now by me, when I'm in the humour for it. Very positively I can assure them of that ; and so leave the matter to their discretion.<sup>1</sup>

Again he pleaded for public support in his General Statement of 1882. He urged the founding of Museums as a public duty rather than as the task of the philanthropist. His happy confidence that Sheffield would give financial aid to his scheme for the development of his Walkley Museum was evident in his statement :

I think it possible that as soon as I send in a definite plan, Sheffield itself alone may frankly give me all I want for the erection.<sup>2</sup>

Unhappily his Report of 1884 told of the final rupture of negotiations at Sheffield where as Ruskin stated in his last Guild Report :

In other words, Sheffield offered, if we would give them our jewels, to make themselves a case for them.<sup>3</sup>

Now his plans turned to the prospect of building a small museum at Bewdley. Despite these many difficulties about the actual site of the Museum, he continued his practical work of building up a National Store of Treasures some of which could be lent to schools and other educational establishments. During the years 1881 to 1889, he used the Guild's available income for this purpose and he procured books, manuscripts, drawings and minerals. He made the following comment on his mineral purchases :

The members of the Guild may perhaps be surprised to see the large sums spent from time to time in purchase of minerals. These have been bought

<sup>1</sup> *Fors* VIII, IV, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 98.

by no means exclusively for the museum at Sheffield, but in view of a design long entertained by me of making minerology, no less than botany, a subject of elementary education, even in ordinary parish schools, and much more in our public ones.<sup>1</sup>

And he went on to explain his years old custom of giving and lending a collection of minerals to schools. He gave some information about his expenditure for the year, which in 1884 amounted to £1000 14s. and added :

I have not the slightest compunction in presenting these accounts to the Guild, feeling entirely confident of the educational value of every article of the things purchased ; so that I may invite persons otherwise uninterested in us, or our plans, to subscribe separately and distinctly to our expenses in these directions.<sup>2</sup>

Such was his ambition and also his faith in the general public, but as his Report of 1885 showed, his hope no less than his faith was misplaced. Despite his own example at Walkley of the kind of work he hoped to do for his country, his plea fell unnoticed by all save his good friend Mrs. Talbot. At times despair would seize him and he would write to her :

of course I won't accept that money. If other people won't help me, as well as you, after all you've done, I shall give up.<sup>3</sup>

At other times he would relent and write as he did in the winter of 1885 :

Dear Mama Talbot,

What a sweet *you* are ! to be so happy in giving away 3 hundred pounds.—Heaven send I may be spared to give you a welcome at the Inn Door and take you through the Jewel room.—All the same—[and he made a chess move] —I can't let your king come over my way, just now.

Ever your gratefullest,  
J. RUSKIN.<sup>4</sup>

His indomitable spirit refused to accept public apathy as defeat and his last Report carried this message :

The educational and archaeological purposes for which I thus instantly want money are only a collateral branch of the work of the St. George's Guild, which is essentially the buying and governing of land for permanent national property ; but while I remain its Master, I mean to direct all its resources to the branch of its work which none can deny my capacity of directing rightly.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/130. 21.12.84.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1161/160. n.d.

<sup>5</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 97.

As already stated, the appeal failed, but Ruskin continued to work independently for his Museum as long as health and time allowed. In 1890, Sheffield Corporation provided spacious new quarters for the Museum at Meersbrook Park, and a tenuous agreement was made whereby the Ruskin collections were loaned to the City for a period of twenty years. This agreement was renewed at intervals by subsequent Masters and Corporation officials until 1953, when it was felt by the Sheffield authorities that the Museum represented unjustifiable expenditure, and so it was closed to the public on April 18th of that year. The late Master of the Guild, Alexander Farquharson, then decided to place the Ruskin collections in the care of Reading University, where the present Master, Professor Hodges, is responsible for the National Store which John Ruskin built for his Guild of St. George.

Apart from these main Guild activities, Ruskin inspired and encouraged others to make industrial experiments. His help and financial support made possible such brave undertakings as Albert Fleming's revival of the Langdale Linen Industry, and Egbert Ryding's work to revive weaving in the Isle of Man. Ruskin was particularly excited by this latter project which he organized; to further this work he financed the building of a water mill at Laxey, known as St. George's Mill. Later Reports show satisfaction that his trustee, George Thomson, a Huddersfield wool merchant, was also directing operations at Laxey. Inspired by Ruskin's principles, George Thomson registered his Huddersfield woollen industry under the Friendly Societies Act and introduced welfare, pension and profit-sharing schemes for his workers. Ruskin wrote to Thomson in 1886:

I cannot enough thank you or express the depth of my pleasure in the announcement made in your letter to Mrs. Severn, of the momentous and absolutely foundational step taken by you in all that is just and wise, in the establishment of these relations with your workmen.<sup>1</sup>

To Ruskin this action was a virtual translation into practice of part of his message in *Fors Clavigera*.

This St. George's work was to John Ruskin the prime task of his life. Indeed it was, as he said, the culmination of his life's

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, Library Edition, xxx. 333.



labour for which he sought fair hearing and fair judgement. It may be that too many of his critics have paused to mock, pity, and rebuke, taking their stand on that portion of the road he failed to sweep clean, thereby losing sight of John Ruskin, the "faithful signpost", and of the path of progress he so clearly indicated.

# THREE ELIZABETHAN ARCHITECTS<sup>1</sup>

By JOHN SUMMERSON, C.B.E., F.B.A.,  
CURATOR OF SIR JOHN SOANE'S MUSEUM

## 1. *Introductory*

ON the main façade of the Victoria and Albert Museum is a series of statues in niches, of representative figures in English architecture. They range from William of Wykeham who stands for the Middle Ages to Sir Charles Barry who stands for the century which was just closing when the museum was built. Among the intermediate figures is one in Elizabethan dress—an imaginary portrait of John Thorpe. His presence there is really an unconscious tribute to Horace Walpole, who discovered and promoted Thorpe, on the strength of the manuscript now in the Soane Museum, as “a very capital artist” of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. From 1782, the publication date of Walpole’s discovery, till very recent times, John Thorpe retained his eminence as almost the only palpable “architect” of the Elizabethan period. In 1949, however, I published a quantity of documentary evidence which placed him in a rather different perspective.<sup>2</sup> The evidence showed that his pre-eminence was altogether exaggerated and that the Soane manuscript, far from being a book of Thorpe’s designs, was in fact a copy-book of plans such as perhaps any surveyor or superior craftsman would have compiled at the period. While Thorpe was certainly an architect up to a point, the only extraordinary thing about him was that his copy-book had survived for Walpole to discover in the library of Warwick Castle and for Soane to enshrine in his Museum. It was that and nothing else which had raised him in effigy to the niche at South Kensington.

The elucidation of John Thorpe’s career served to open up the question of Elizabethan designs and designers in general. In particular the fact that Thorpe’s main employment up to the year

<sup>1</sup> The expanded text of a lecture delivered in the John Ryland’s Library on Wednesday, the 15th. May, 1957.

<sup>2</sup> J. Summerson, “John Thorpe and the Thorpes of Kingscliffe”, *Architectural Review* (November, 1949).

1601 (when he was about thirty-eight) was as a clerk in the Office of Works suggested that some of the other clerks employed there might have been no less active than Thorpe in copying and making designs ; and furthermore, that the senior officers in the Works might prove to have been among the leading figures in the architectural world (if such a phrase can be allowed) in Elizabeth's reign. Intensive research in the records of the Queen's Works<sup>1</sup> has to a certain extent proved the correctness of this speculation. A number of personalities have emerged with considerably greater pretensions to leadership than John Thorpe ; and although the whole picture of Elizabethan architectural designing is still very defective it is possible to recognize that the period saw the detachment, here and there, of the professional designer from the ordinary run of administrators and designer craftsmen. The three biographies which follow are instances of this process, and although there is no evidence that any of the three was denominated " architect " in his lifetime, one of them (Adams) was described as *architecturae peritissimus* on his tomb and another (Stickells) as " the excellent artichect of our time " eleven years after his death. The third (Symonds) does not appear as " architect " in any document I have found, but he so clearly filled the rôle that I have no hesitation in grouping him with the other two as an " Elizabethan architect ".

All three of these men held offices in the Queen's Works—Adams as Surveyor, Symonds and Stickells as clerks, but in all three cases it was work outside that organization which earned them their reputations. The Office of Works under Elizabeth I was not, after all, very productive of opportunity, being in fact little more than a palace maintenance department. On the other hand the Office was a *cadre* to which the best technical and designing skill was automatically recruited. When Inigo Jones became surveyor in 1615 the Office sprang into brilliant architectural activity but it could hardly have done so had it not had a long tradition of competence behind it. Not the least interesting

<sup>1</sup> Principally the series of Declared Accounts (E. 351 and A.O. 1) in the Public Record Office. Papers relating to the Works are also found scattered throughout the State Papers (Domestic), the Lansdowne MSS. in the British Museum and the Salisbury MSS. at Hatfield.

aspect of the Elizabethan architects is the manner in which they brought about a situation where, under James I, the genius of Inigo Jones instantly found place and full expression. A complete history of the Office is at present in hand <sup>1</sup> and will include a considerable number of biographies. Three only are given here, in expanded form and accompanied by documents which will not be printed in the history.

## 2. Robert Adams

Robert Adams was one of the seven surviving children of Clement Adams, a man of considerable scholarly and artistic distinction who held the post of school master to the king's and later the queen's henchmen (or pages of honour) from 1552 till his death in 1587. Clement was both scholar and artist. He gave us the first written account (in Latin) of one of the earliest episodes in English intercourse with Russia—the expedition of Richard Chancellor in 1553-4. Hakluyt credits him with an engraving of Cabot's *Mappe-Monde*, displayed "in many merchants' houses in London" but now untraceable.<sup>2</sup> And we know that his new year gift to the queen in 1561 was "a patorn of a peir of sleeves"—perhaps a design for embroidery.<sup>3</sup>

Robert inherited his father's artistic gifts. In 1581 a house at Dogmersfield, Hants, was being built for Henry Wriothesley, 2nd earl of Southampton, "according to the forme . . . and modell made by Adams of Grenew<sup>ch</sup>".<sup>4</sup> This could be either father or son but the future Surveyor is, on the face of it, the likelier. About the same time we find the name of Robert Adams in the Works accounts (1581-2) where it is joined with that of Humphrey Coole, instrument-maker, in an entry for "new making the Dial in the Great Garden".<sup>5</sup> Adams' share of this work is likely to have been the design and cutting of copper plates for the dial. This is his only appearance in the Works prior to

<sup>1</sup> Under the general editorship of Mr. Howard Colvin.

<sup>2</sup> Article in *D.N.B.*, where the relationship to Robert is not noted. A. M. Hind, *Engraving in England*, i. 144-5.

<sup>3</sup> J. Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* (1823), i. 118.

<sup>4</sup> Wriothesley's will, dated 29 June 1581; P. C. C. Rowe, 45.

<sup>5</sup> E. 351. 3216.



the surveyorship he was eventually to occupy but he must already have been active in the queen's service for in 1582 he was granted a pension of £40 a year "for good causes and considerations" which the patent unfortunately does not specify.<sup>1</sup> In 1585 Adams was enjoying the patronage of Secretary Walsingham, for there is a plan of Flushing, belonging to that year, in the Hatfield collection, in which Adams describes Walsingham as his "Maecenas".<sup>2</sup> It was the year of the treaty between England and the States General, when Flushing and two other places were handed over as "cautionary" towns, so the reason for Adams' visit is obvious.

In 1588, Armada year, Adams executed a map of the Thames from Tilbury to London, showing the route of the queen's celebrated progress to Tilbury,<sup>3</sup> and in 1590 appeared the famous series of plates of the defeat of the Armada, engraved by Augustine Ryther from Adams' drawings.<sup>4</sup> The Armada, famous victory though it was, was also a warning of what Spain could do and would almost certainly attempt again as soon as possible and in 1589 there was every reason to strengthen England's foothold in the Netherlands, where a Spanish army might be landed. In August, therefore, money was sent to Sir John Conway, governor of Ostend, with orders to patch up the fortifications.<sup>5</sup> The Council seems to have been doubtful of Conway's competence in these matters and accordingly in September sent Adams over as "a man of skill and understanding in these kinde of workes".<sup>6</sup> This is the first we hear of him as a master of fortification but it was in fact his chief recommendation. His instructions for Ostend were very full. He was to consider (a) whether the defences were not too far gone to be worth repair, (b) if not too far gone, what the cost would be of repairing them and where labour and materials were to come from, (c) at what cost sea-defences (i.e. against erosion) could be made, (d) whether materials could not be better got from Zealand than this country, (e) what revenue for works was available in Ostend and how it

<sup>1</sup> Pat. Roll. 24 Eliz., pt. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 44839.

<sup>4</sup> Hind, *op. cit.* pp. 142-5 and Pls. 81-5.

<sup>5</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council*, N.S., xviii. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Hatfield Plans, ii. 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 150.

might be increased, (*f*) what, if Ostend could not be made defensible by the winter, would be the best time and method of evacuation (this was to be ascertained secretly), (*g*) how the town could be destroyed, if evacuated, and (*h*) what, in general, could be done about fortification.<sup>1</sup>

A commission of this weight shows us that Adams was far more than a maker of maps and designer of houses. He was, in fact, the Government's leading English expert on fortification and was to be trusted with strategic secrets. His report on Ostend does not survive, but it was acted upon in November 1589 when Conway was instructed to repair Ostend with all speed and with Adams' advice.<sup>2</sup> Adams went over and in June 1590 was still there and was allowed to nominate a clerk to attend him.<sup>3</sup> In the same month, however, funds ran out; Adams and his clerk were given a month's notice and the oversight of the works was recommended to "wise and discreet burghers of Ostend".<sup>4</sup> The defences were not tested till the attack of 1601.

Adams' clerk at Ostend was evidently Simon Basil, for there is a plan of Ostend signed by him as Adams' servant dated 1590.<sup>5</sup> Its style is indistinguishable from his master's.

While Adams was in Ostend, the Council was further considering some of the factors in the defence of England against the next armada, and these included the fortification of Plymouth and of the Scillies. In both cases, local projects were being submitted but, as at Ostend, the Council preferred the authoritative advice of Adams. He was dispatched to the west in March 1592, his letter of instructions containing the information that the queen "hath made choyce of you as one that hath of late yeeres ben acquainted with the manner of many fortyficacions beyond the seas".<sup>6</sup> His experience of Netherlandish towns hardly prepared him, however, for the cliffs and rocks of Plymouth, with which he was greatly struck. He recommended a somewhat drastic revision of the local scheme, which was for walling the whole town, and designed a roughly triangular fort for the Hoe

<sup>1</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council*, N.S., xviii, 152.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xix, 193.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 237.

<sup>5</sup> Hatfield Plans, i, 51.

<sup>6</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council*, N.S., xxii, 355.

which was put into execution and more or less finished by 1596, probably under Simon Basil.<sup>1</sup> I suspect that the southern part of the Citadel of 1666-70, which still exists, incorporates much of Adams' work.

From Plymouth Adams went on to Scilly and again designed a fort, this time on a plan of strictly regular form, to stand on Hugh Hill, St. Mary's Isle. It is still there and is called Star Castle, though I have not yet solved the problem why the existing building deviates from a progress plan prepared, probably by Adams, about 1594.<sup>2</sup> There is some correspondence between Adams and Lord Burghley about this fort, a passage from which is worth quoting. Adams asks (6 August 1593) for the payment of his entertainment to be expedited "for the supply of my poore wantes in this Sylley place, who with my five myles dayly journey to and from the forte and my continuall eye over the masons (who not easily conceave and hardlier execute this manor of wallinge) am inforced to attende the layinge of everie stone, whose hardnesse and difficultye to digge, with the huge bignes thereof, to presume to tell youre Lo: I dare not".<sup>3</sup>

Adams was making himself out an exemplary servant of the Crown before reminding Burghley, at the end of the letter, that he looked to him to further his suit with the queen—almost certainly for the Surveyorship of Works which had then been vacant since 1590. By the same post went a letter to Burghley from Sir Francis Godolphin, governor of the Scillies, containing fulsome tributes to Adams, clearly designed to promote the same object.<sup>4</sup> "Besydes his perfect skill in nombres and measures, hee is very provident in savinge and no lesse painefull in attendinge." At the court of Elizabeth, to be "very provident in savinge" was the highest recommendation an official could have.

Robert Adams' suit to the queen was eventually successful and his patent as Surveyor of the Queen's Majesty's Works issued on 6 September 1594.<sup>5</sup> His period of office was cut short, however, by his death about a year later. He was buried near his father in the north aisle of Greenwich church and in 1601 his former

<sup>1</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 241, nos. 116 and 116 (i); vol. 245, nos. 20, 20 (i and ii).

<sup>2</sup> Hatfield Plans, ii. 34.

<sup>3</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 245, no. 70.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. no. 72.

<sup>5</sup> Pat. Roll 36 Eliz., pt. 15.

servant, Simon Basil, risen by then to the comptrollership of the works, placed a monument there. Stow's editor gives the inscription, unfortunately omitting the particular of the dead man's age :

*Egregio viro, Roberto Adams, operum Regiarum Supervisor  
Architecturæ peritissimo ; Religione & moribus Integerrimo  
Qui pie obiit Anno suæ Aetatis 1595  
Simon Basil operationum Regiarum Controtulator hoc posuit  
Monumentum 1601.*<sup>1</sup>

A postscript to Adams' career is provided by a letter from his brother Thomas to Lord Burghley. From this we learn that Robert, before his death, had charged Thomas to deliver all his plans and other papers to Burghley and, furthermore, to tell him of a servant of his who was "able in platt or model to set down" such fortifications as Burghley should see fit to employ him about.<sup>2</sup> We need have little doubt that this servant was Simon Basil. The letter alludes to the queen's sorrow for Adams' death and her anxiety that his plans should be preserved.<sup>3</sup>

In spite of the negligible period of Adams' service, his association with the Works is significant. He represents a clean break with the older type of Surveyor who was a carpenter or mason by training and later assumed administrative responsibilities. It is true that he was not quite the first of the new type, for his predecessor, Thomas Blagrove (Surveyor from 1586 to 1590), was never a craftsman and was trained up in the Office of Revels where he spent all but the last part of his career. But Adams represents clearly the English version of the type of Court intellectual who in earlier times was usually imported from the continent. His evident qualifications in design, map making and, above all in the theory of fortification, make him the equivalent of the "devisers of buildings", such as Stephen von Haschenperg or John of Padua, whom Henry VIII had brought in.<sup>4</sup> In Adams, the "deviser" is anglicized and is placed at the head of the Works. Furthermore, Adams left behind him a

<sup>1</sup> J. Stow, *Survey of London* (1633), p. 804.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm., Hatfield*, v. 378.

<sup>3</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 253, no. 107 lists 39 plans in Adams' possession on 13 Sept., 1595.

<sup>4</sup> J. Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, (2nd edn., 1955), p. 5.



disciple who was to carry this new tradition right up to Inigo Jones's accession in 1615. This was Simon Basil who, having been a clerk in the Works under Adams became Comptroller and eventually, in 1608, Surveyor when he and Jones were almost certainly in close association.

### 3. *John Symonds*

John Symonds came of an old family of yeomen and small gentry one branch of which had settled at Newport, Shropshire, where he was probably born.<sup>1</sup> He began his career as an apprentice of Lewis Stocket,<sup>2</sup> who occupied the post of Surveyor of the Queen's Works from 1563 to 1579.<sup>3</sup> Stocket was a mason, but when the joiners' company received its charter in 1571, he figured as master of that company.<sup>4</sup> What this means is, I think, that Stocket was primarily a carver in stone and wood. In this dual capacity Symonds followed him. Up to 1583 we know of him as a working or supervising mason, but by 1588 he was certainly in the joiners' company<sup>5</sup> and he calls himself "joyner" in his will.

Symonds was probably out of his apprenticeship by 1566-7 for in that year he was working under Richard Popinjay who was Surveyor of Portsmouth and advising the government on the fortification of Guernsey.<sup>6</sup> He is described as Popinjay's man and is paid for attendance and for drawing during a period of seventy-seven days. Symonds then returned to the Office of Works, where Stocket employed him at a low wage on the new fountain of the palace of Greenwich in December 1567.<sup>7</sup> This was one of the very few architectural showpieces of Elizabeth's

<sup>1</sup> P. Morant, *History of Essex* (1768), ii. 302. *Visitations of Essex*, Harl. Soc., vol. xiii (1878), pt. 1. *D.N.B.*, s.v. "Richard Symonds". At the College of Arms is a collection of Essex genealogical notes compiled by Richard Symonds (1617-92?). In vol. 2, fol. 613, is a Symonds genealogy. Our John Symonds is not mentioned but it seems likely that his grandfather will have been John Symonds of Newport.

<sup>2</sup> In Symonds will he refers to "my finest pensell guilded which was my Mr. Stockettes".

<sup>3</sup> Works Declared Accounts, E 351, 3202-12, in the Public Record Office.

<sup>4</sup> Joiners' Company charter of incorporation, Guildhall Lib., MS. 8036.

<sup>5</sup> Guildhall Lib., MS. 8064, Parcel no. 1, 20.

<sup>6</sup> S.P. 15, vol. 13, no. 66.

<sup>7</sup> Bodleian Lib. MS. Rawl. A. 195, C.

court and required expert craftsmanship. For four years after 1567 there are no clues to Symonds' movements but in 1571-2 he appears in the Works accounts as Purveyor in connection with a Royal Progress.<sup>1</sup> For eleven years from that date he was continuously employed in the Works in various capacities—sometimes as clerk, sometimes rather as visiting supervisor. The pattern of his functions, as reflected in the accounts, is different from and obviously superior to that of the typical clerk or purveyor who followed a strict routine. He was probably responsible, under Stocket, for the large new gallery built at Woking palace in 1578-81.<sup>2</sup> It was a brick and timber structure but there was a carved representation in stone of the queen's arms and cognizances and this Symonds executed with his own hands.<sup>3</sup> He last figures in the Works accounts in 1581-2 when he was acting as store-keeper and clerk at Somerset House, where a new stair was being put in.<sup>4</sup>

It is during his association with the Office of Works that Symonds emerges as a man of special distinction for in 1577 Lord Burghley seems to have adopted him as his private architect. The first evidence of this is a drawing in the Hatfield collection of a gateway for Lord Burghley's house at Theobalds signed by Symonds and dated in that year.<sup>5</sup> Burghley's previous architect had been Henry Hawthorne whose official post was that of Purveyor to the Works.<sup>6</sup> Hawthorne had made many of the earlier drawings for Theobalds and then been given an important post at Windsor where he made the drawings for the new gallery (now the library) and other things.<sup>7</sup> References to Hawthorne are not found, however, after 1577 and he may have died in that year. At Theobalds, Symonds succeeded him.

In 1578 there is still more important evidence. Thomas Fowler, the Comptroller of the Works, writes to Burghley, on 29 September, a letter chiefly about the progress of works at Woking.<sup>8</sup> But the letter begins, "It maie please your Lordship

<sup>1</sup> E 351, 3206.

<sup>2</sup> E 351, 3213-15.

<sup>3</sup> E 351, 3215. Payment of 20s. for task-work.

<sup>4</sup> E 351, 3216.

<sup>5</sup> Hatfield MSS., vol. 143, no. 47.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1560-1563*, p. 301.

<sup>7</sup> W. H. St. J. Hope, *Windsor Castle* (1913), chap. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Hatfield MSS., vol. 143, no. 99.

I have sent you the Platt from John Symons According as you gave him order ” and an endorsement of the letter in a contemporary hand makes it clear that this platt referred not to Woking and not to Theobalds but to Burghley House at Stamford. Now in 1578 Lord Burghley had had the rebuilding of this house in hand for two or three years : the date 1577 appears on the vault of the West entrance.<sup>1</sup> We do not know who made the first drawings—it may or may not have been Hawthorne—but it does look as if, in 1578, Symonds was the source of drawings for Burghley as he was for Theobalds. And Symonds’ association with the Cecil family certainly continued. In or about 1595 he submitted plans for remodelling Robert Cecil’s house at Chelsea <sup>2</sup> and in 1595-6 there is a payment to him as Surveyor in charge of Lord Burghley’s London houses.<sup>3</sup> So without infringing on the probability that Burghley used more than one architect for his private buildings during this period it is obvious at least that Symonds figures prominently among them.

Returning now to Symonds’ official appointments under the Crown, we have seen that the last payments to him in the Works accounts are in the roll for 1581-2. In 1582 he was sent to Dover where he spent the season May-September supervising repairs at the castle to the value of some £200.<sup>4</sup> He was getting the respectable wage of 3s. 4d. a day and although this was probably only paid during the execution of works he was granted a lease or leases at Dover by Lord Burghley<sup>5</sup> and enjoyed the title of Surveyor of Dover Castle, for a grant of arms which he obtained in 1591 so describes him.<sup>6</sup> At Dover he was drawn into the great harbour project which, after much preparation, was begun in May 1583.<sup>7</sup> In June he was recommended as the mason for a sluice but he advised that a stone sluice would take a year to make

<sup>1</sup> C. Hussey, “ Burghley House, Northants ”, in *Country Life* (10 December 1953).

<sup>2</sup> W. H. Godfrey, “ Sir Thomas More’s House at Chelsea ”, in Clapham and Godfrey, *Some Famous Buildings and their Story*.

<sup>3</sup> Hatfield MSS. vol. 154, no. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 34147.

<sup>5</sup> S.P. 19, vol. 163, no. 62 (i).

<sup>6</sup> There are three records of this grant, viz. Harl. 1422, fol. 65b ; Harl. 1359, fol. 112b ; Stowe, 670, fol. 46b.

<sup>7</sup> R. Holinshed, *Chron.*, iv. 849 ff.

and the sluice was therefore made by the ship-builders, Peter Pett and Matthew Baker.<sup>1</sup> On 1 December 1583 he was again sent to Dover with Pett to take depths and levels of the harbour entrance.<sup>2</sup> In the following autumn he was still acting as a consultant, with Robert Stickells, in the harbour business<sup>3</sup> and the excellent plan by him in the Public Record Office probably dates from about this time.<sup>4</sup>

After 1584, Dover cannot have taken much of his time and he was considered fit for an office of a totally different kind, that of Master Plasterer in the Works. Since 1567 this office had been held by Thomas Kelly<sup>5</sup> but in 1585 a new patent issued in which Symonds was joined with Kelly.<sup>6</sup> This was the usual practice in cases where a patentee was getting past his work, as Kelly probably was. In 1590 Kelly died<sup>7</sup> and Symonds held the office alone till his own death in 1597. On the face of it, the appointment of a joiner who was also a practising mason and carver in stone to the office of Master Plasterer seems very curious. One may suspect that Lord Burghley stretched a point in order to find a suitable reward for his own architect and, of course, the patent contained the usual provision for performance by "sufficient deputy". The appointment also suggests the possibility that some members of the joiners' company—which was, indeed, the company of "joiners, ceilers and carvers"—regarded themselves as purveyors of all fine ornamental work whether in stone, wood or plaster. In any case, there is no doubt about Symonds' tenure of this office and although the Works' accounts contain no mention of any task-work by him there is an indication who his "sufficient deputy" was. At Woking in 1593-4 and at Whitehall in that year and again in 1595-6 plastering was being done by a certain John Allen.<sup>8</sup> This is probably the John Allen described in Symonds' will as "somtyme my servant" and to whom he left all his stone-cutting tools, half his plans, his best case of compasses, old Stocket's pencil and much else. Allen evidently

<sup>1</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 161, no. 7.

<sup>2</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 173, Nos. 27, 95.

<sup>3</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 173, nos. 27, 95.

<sup>4</sup> M.P.F., 122 in P.R.O.

<sup>5</sup> *Pat. Roll*, 9 Eliz., pt. 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 27 Eliz., pt. 10.

<sup>7</sup> *Cal. S. P. Dom. Eliz. (1581-1590)*, p. 714.

<sup>8</sup> E 351, 3228 and 3230.



could execute, or at least organize, plastering. Yet he, too, was a member of the joiners'—and was left stone-cutting implements!

Symonds' association with the joiners' company was an important element in his career. The records of the company are exiguous at this period and we do not know if Symonds was ever master. We do know, however, that he was an eminent, influential and trusted liveryman, for in 1590 he undertook to purchase a property in the Vintry from the patentees who held it and to convey it to a group of joiners and others to hold in trust for the company as their hall. He was partnered in this transaction by another joiner, Humfrey Baker, who was his father-in-law and figures in the will. The company provided the money but at Symonds' death they owed him £50 which in his will he remitted. In 1593 he and Baker signed a deed mutually extinguishing all obligations between them and the enfeofees in respect of the hall.<sup>1</sup>

This latter document has the special interest of bearing an impression of Symonds' seal—an armorial seal with his initials and the date 1576; it was perhaps "my seal ring of golde" left in the will to his eldest son. The date is fifteen years before the grant of arms by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux, in 1591, with which it corresponds exactly. The grant was no doubt in the nature of a confirmation for these arms had been associated with the name of Symonds for a long period.<sup>2</sup>

John Symonds, therefore, claimed gentility, though neither in his will nor elsewhere is he described as "gentleman". The will does, however, mention "my cosen Mr. Richard Symandes Esquier" who is nominated one of the two executors. This was Richard Symonds of Yeldham, Essex, who had a variant of this coat of arms confirmed to him in 1625 and died in 1627; he was grandfather of Richard Symonds (1617-92?) the Royalist and antiquary.<sup>3</sup> The earlier Richard was a cursitor in the court of Chancery<sup>4</sup> and there must be some connection between his

<sup>1</sup> Guildhall Lib., MS. 8064.

<sup>2</sup> Burke, Gen. Armory, s.v. Symonds. The arms as tricked in the grant are: per fess sa. and ar. a pale counterchanged, three trefoils of the second, a border counterchanged. Crest: on a mount vert an ermine ar. holding in the mouth a pansy ppr.

<sup>3</sup> See n. 1, p. 209, *ante*.

<sup>4</sup> C 207/27 (a bundle of papers relating to the cursitors) in P.R.O.

tenure of this office and the fact that plans exist, drawn by his architect cousin, for *Cursitors' Hall*, in *Chancery Lane*.<sup>1</sup> They are not dated but the hall was built by the *cursitors* as an addition to *Cursitors' Inn*, founded and built by Sir Nicholas Bacon, who died in 1579.<sup>2</sup>

In 1597 John Symonds died and was buried in *St. Martin's-in-the-Fields* on 7 June. It appears from the register that his wife, Elizabeth, had been buried there only a week earlier and on the day she was buried Symonds signed his will.<sup>3</sup> Neither of them can have been old, for their children—three sons and four daughters—were all minors.

The will, printed in full here (pp. 222-5), is a longer document than most of its kind. The estate was to be divided into two—one half to be shared in strict equality between the seven children, the other consisting of a number of specified legacies. Unfortunately it is only the division of the second part which the testator found it necessary to particularize, so we have no idea what gross property Symonds died possessed of. That there was substantial wealth in some readily divisible form is obvious. For the sons were certainly not expected to follow the father's trade: all tools and drawings were distributed between a present and a former servant and an apprentice, while the "*Jacob's staffe*", a surveying instrument, went to a brother. The children must have been effectively provided for by their seventh parts of the estate not detailed; and the two executors must have been privy to much information of which the will leaves us in ignorance.

John Symonds was clearly well-to-do. He was able to remit debts and distribute gifts among a wide circle of colleagues and friends. Among those who received 20s. funeral rings, William Spicer was the comptroller and Henry Fadys the joint-comptroller of the Works. Matthew Switzer was a clerk, shortly to become paymaster. William Portinton (or Partington) was the master-carpenter, Cornelius Cure the master-mason. John Thorpe, George Wilde (Weale in the Works accounts) and Henry

<sup>1</sup> M.P. A. 71.

<sup>2</sup> One of the papers in C 207/27, a deed agreeing the apportionment of costs in a suit for a new patent, c. 1596, gives some facts about the buildings.

<sup>3</sup> *Registers of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields*, Harl. Soc. (Reg.), vol. 25.

Blader (usually Bludder) are mentioned as clerks. John Marshall, who was left a sword and dagger, was another clerk.<sup>1</sup> A particularly striking feature of the will is the attention paid to articles of clothing.

Although it has been possible to assemble something towards an outline of Symonds' career it is still very difficult to say much about him as an architect. Some half-dozen drawings or sets of drawings by him survive.<sup>2</sup> They show him to have been an extremely careful, accurate and even elegant executant but they are mostly of a kind which leaves his designing abilities out of account. As a house planner he must have had a wide reputation for there is the case of a Worcestershire squire, Sir Edward Pytts of Kyre, sending to him for a plan for the new house he was building in 1588.<sup>3</sup> The drawing of the Theobalds gateway suggests that he had no great skill in ornamental technique and the set of plans for Cursitors' Hall is very conservative in style. Yet one can well see the draughtsman of the Theobalds gateway as the deviser of all those quaint upper works at Burghley House, all quite primitive in detail but dramatic in total effect. Probably Symonds, unlike his contemporary Robert Adams, was representative of the native tradition in building rather than the new architectural sophistication. He will have combined thorough knowledge of at least two and perhaps three materials with uncommon powers of presentation, with administrative ability

<sup>1</sup> All these officers are met with in the Works Declared Accounts.

<sup>2</sup> Two plans of the Palace of Havering, Essex, one dated in Burghley's hand 1578, are reproduced in A. W. Clapham and W. H. Godfrey, *Some Famous Buildings and their Story*, pp. 148-9. In the same work (pp. 82-3) are reproduced two plans for Robert Cecil's house at Chelsea. All these plans, except one of the two Havering plans ("said to be in the Lansdowne MSS."), are at Hatfield. Also at Hatfield are two fine plans of the buildings of Christ Church, Aldgate. The design for the Theobalds gateway, also at Hatfield, will be published with an article by me on Theobalds in *Archaeologia*, vol. 97 (1957). The Cursitors' Hall plans in the P.R.O. have not been published, but the Dover Harbour plan is given in *Archaeologia*, vol. 72 (1921-2), with an article on Dover plans by W. Minet.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Baldwin-Childe, "The Building of Kyre Park, Worcestershire" in *The Antiquary*, xxi (1890). Pytts paid Symonds 40s. and, later on, £3 for a new plan, "according to my new purpose". The house, which does not now exist, was probably built on some version of Symonds' plan under the direction of Pytts himself and his mason.

and perhaps also with a gentleness of manner (in the social sense of "gentle") which made him agreeable to his superiors. That he took pains to appear well dressed is a point upon which his will leaves us in no doubt whatever.

#### 4. *Robert Stickells*

The name of Robert Stickells is found in several contexts associated with that of John Symonds and they were probably men of rather similar professional type. Stickells outlived Symonds by twenty-three years but as Symonds died relatively young there is no reason to suppose that he was a much older man.

Robert Stickells' early years remain obscure<sup>1</sup> though as he describes himself as freemason in his will we may suppose that he was apprenticed to that trade. Nevertheless, by 1583 he had a reputation as an engineer and his name was put forward in connection with the same Dover harbour project upon which Symonds was employed.<sup>2</sup> He was sent to Dover in June 1584, his main task there being to "weigh" rocks, or in other words to clear these obstructions from the mouth of the harbour by floating them up with barrels and chains and then floating them to a jetty in process of construction.<sup>3</sup> For a time, Stickells and Paul Ive, or Ivey, a military engineer, were "masters of the work" at Dover harbour.<sup>4</sup> The work was completed in 1585 and we next hear of Stickells in London and in a very different connection. In 1591 the wardens of the Grocers' company were ordered "to confer with a joynere of abilitie and a skilful workeman how [the hall] may be conveniently wainscoted upon the view and sight of good and convenient patterns".<sup>5</sup> They evidently consulted Stickells for in due course he was employed "to oversee the worke" at a wage of 20d. a day, his two chief

<sup>1</sup> The name Stickells and its variants (Stickles, Sticeles) is very uncommon and the indexes of the Harleian Society and the Index Society give no help in localizing it. Nor do the Huguenot Society's lists of aliens allow one to suppose it an anglicization of a foreign name.

<sup>2</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 163, no. 62 (i).

<sup>3</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 171, no. 49; vol. 172, no. 18.

<sup>4</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 173, no. 18. For Ive see *D.N.B.*

<sup>5</sup> J. B. Heath, *Some Account of the Worshipful Company of Grocers* (2nd edn., 1854), p. 13.



workmen getting 18d. and the rest 16d. with two boys at 8d. (this was good pay, judged by Office of Works standards). So Stickells seems to have been, like Symonds, a man who handled both stone and timber, at least in a supervisory capacity.

In 1595 Stickells made a display of his inventive skill which was thought worthy of reference, though somewhat laconic, by the 1631 editors of Stow's *Chronicle*.<sup>1</sup>

This yere master Stickles, the excellent Artichect of our time, did onely to try conclusion, build a pinnace in Leadenhall, being of burden about five or six tun, which at pleasure might be taken a sunder, and joyned together, it was drawne uppon a Sled with wheeles to the tower docke, where it was launched, but there came no good of it.

This naval experiment connects very clearly with the weighing of rocks at Dover and we shall meet further evidence that water-borne structures were a speciality of Stickells. Nevertheless, Stow's editors were right in calling him an architect, for in the same year as the pinnace affair he is said to have been recommended by the Earl of Derby for the surveyorship of works,<sup>2</sup> in succession to Robert Adams. The post, however, went to an older man, William Spicer, who had worked for Sir John Thynne at Longleat and for the Earl of Leicester at Kenilworth.<sup>3</sup> Stickells had to be content with a clerkship in the Works which he commenced in 1597-8, though he stated later that he had been employed by the Crown since 1585 or 1587.<sup>4</sup> As clerk and store-keeper he was at Greenwich in 1597-8; in 1598-9 he was clerk on day and night shifts at Richmond and thereafter he was continuously at Richmond till 1619, the year before his death.<sup>5</sup>

Stickells was again to seek promotion, this time to the post of joiner to the queen's privy chamber.<sup>6</sup> The year was perhaps

<sup>1</sup> J. Stow, *Chronicle* (1631), p. 769.

<sup>2</sup> The statement is on one of the two Stickells papers printed here as App. III (Lansdowne 84, no. 10 (ii)) but has been struck through. In 1595 the earl in question would be William Stanley, 15th earl who succeeded his brother Ferdinando in 1594 and died 1642.

<sup>3</sup> C. Hussey, "Longleat, Wilts", in *Country Life* (8 April 1949), p. 801.

<sup>4</sup> In the letter to Sir R. Cecil quoted later. The date of his commencement in the works depends on the dating of the letter.

<sup>5</sup> Works accounts, E 351, 3233, etc.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Hatfield MSS., pt. 11, p. 566.

1599 when a vacancy occurred with the death of William Jasper<sup>1</sup> but this would assume that the endorsement "1601" on Stickells' letter to Sir Robert Cecil is an error. In any case, whatever the year, the letter is in terms which give us a clue to Stickells' character: it has the knowing conceit of the professional who has discovered a new status. "Although some say that to study for the truth in that which a man professes is but idleness . . . he desires to come to his trial before the Council with any workman seen in these actions either for sea or land." But, once again, Stickells was to be disappointed: the office went to a real joiner, John Jenyver, who was to do so much fine work for Cecil at Hatfield.<sup>2</sup>

So he continued his clerkship at Richmond, designing, evidently, a lodge in the park; for among the Thorpe drawings in the Soane Museum is a pair of alternative plans of a small house inscribed by Thorpe "Richmont Lodg" and, below, "Stickles".<sup>3</sup>

But Stickells' fame as an "excellent Artichect" extended far beyond Richmond for there are two cases of country gentlemen obtaining drawings from him. The first case is of special interest. In the Tresham papers at the British Museum is a letter from Stickells dated 10 January in an unknown year, certainly in or before 1605, to Sir Thomas Tresham at Rushton, Northants.<sup>4</sup> The latter must have accompanied a drawing, now lost, for Stickells writes: "I have mayd the ordnance accordinge to yo. Request, and have mayde them by the Simetry or measwer agreinge withe the Doricke Architrave frees and corniche." He adds that he leaves the enrichment of the frieze to Tresham and his workmen. Another letter, from Tresham to his steward, Levens, and dated 1604, makes it clear that in that year the curious and never-to-be-completed cross-house called Lyveden New Building was in progress.<sup>5</sup> It certainly has a Doric entablature and this may be the subject of Stickells' letter.

But there is more to it than that. The Tresham papers also include a pair of drawings which the editors of the Historic MSS. Commission reproduced and unwisely identified as "Hawkfield

<sup>1</sup> S.P. 12, vol. 270, no. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Sir John Soane's Museum: Thorpe MS. p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 39829, fol. 194.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. fol. 130.

Lodge " at Rushton.<sup>1</sup> What these drawings really represent is a very elaborate timber louvre or roof-tower supported on a floor framed in a manner illustrated by Serlio.<sup>2</sup> It is an almost impossible structure for a normal Elizabethan house but the plan dimensions exactly fit the " crossing " at Lyveden New Building ; so it appears, surely, that that strange enterprise in symbolic architecture was to be surmounted by a two-stage louvre of the Ionic and Corinthian orders with a domed roof and great elliptical ball on top. And the importance of this for us is that one of the drawings bears the initials R.S. Evidently Stickells was the man whom Tresham consulted when projecting the last and most ambitious of his famous architectural fantasies.

The other reference to Stickells as an adviser to house builders comes from the Kyre, Worcs., manuscript which, as we have seen, contains also a reference to John Symonds.<sup>3</sup> Symonds was Sir Edward Pytts' first consultant (1588) ; Stickells was not approached till 1613 when he was paid a fee for " drawing the platt of my house anewe ". This was probably not Kyre but a London house which Pytts then had in hand.

In 1620, Stickells died and was buried at St. Olave's, Southwark, on 31 May. The register gives him as " Robert Stickels Masone ". His will (printed here, p. 225) dated 6 May, is in sad contrast to Symonds' and seems to represent a none too prosperous way of life. We learn that Stickells was a widower but we hear of no children, only a cousin, John Bradley. The various legatees might be identified from a thorough search of the St. Olave's register. Matthew Grace, an overseer and father of Richard Grace who got the books and working tools, was a joiner living in Southwark.<sup>4</sup>

Stickells' abilities as a designer can only be judged by the drawing in the Tresham papers and the sketchy plans among the Thorpe drawings. He left, however, the two very curious papers which are reprinted here and which seem to have been designed

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm., Various Collections*, vol. 3, pp. xlvi, lxxiii, lxxvii. The drawings are now Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 39831, fols. 3 and 4.

<sup>2</sup> S. Serlio, Lib. 1 (1566), p. 15 verso.

<sup>3</sup> J. Summerson, *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830* (2nd edn. 1955), pp. 25-6.

<sup>4</sup> The registers of St. Olave's, Southwark, are preserved in the vestry hall of St. John Horselydown, Fair Street, S.E.1.

to advertise his abilities to some patron.<sup>1</sup> They are semi-literate and at the same time esoteric, a combination which renders their interpretation peculiarly difficult. One of the papers is dated (in a contemporary hand which is not Stickells') 26 November 1597. The other is undated but bears a note to the effect that Stickells was recommended for the Surveyorship in September 1595.

Taking the dated paper first, it is headed (I am modernizing the spelling) "Proportions propounded unto the learned and skilful". Then follow five paragraphs of which the first reads :

First, it would be known whether the works modern or the works antique is of most effect and which of them contain most truth ; they both consist in all things living ; and being separated, the one is sensible the other insensible ; no senseless thing can be perfect before by life it is made perfect.

The meaning of this is clarified by a note at the end of the paper in which the author says : " I see all buildings grounded upon the imperfect sense, the books of architecture, Vitruvius and all those authors have taken the wrong sense ; their inwards works are dead when they show no life in their outward doings." From which we gather that Stickles is opposed to the antique because it is insensible, dead. But if we turn to the second paper we find another observation containing exactly the contrary meaning :

There are two sorts of buildings, the one in sense, the other without sense ; the antique in sense, the modern without sense ; because it is from circular demonstration without sense in that no circle riseth in evenness of number, because they are derived from an ichnographical ground ; yet (?) the uneven may be brought into proportions as well as the even, etc.

A further note reads : " there is no more but right and wrong in all things whatsoever, the square right, the circle wrong, etc."

Apparently Stickells was prepared to argue both ways—for and against the antique ; though the argument, such as it is, is extremely baffling. But these philosophizings are not the main purpose of the papers, which is rather to declare what Stickells will do if he is challenged. Articles 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the dated paper are repeated in different words and different order in the other. Three of the articles relate to house-building. On a site 107 ft. by 84 ft. (an oddly selected ratio—just not 9 : 7) how high should the house be? Given the breadth of a room in this house, how to get the height. Given the height between floors

<sup>1</sup> Lansdowne 84, no. 10, i and ii.



how to get the sizes of posts and walls. And there is one ship-building proposition: given the tonnage of a ship, how to dimension the component parts.

These propositions are common to both papers. But the second (undated) paper is in two parts. The first is headed "Buildings for the seas, not used" and under this are three propositions. (1) "To make a ship shoot free and also fire free." A marginal note states that Sir Francis Drake was ordered by the queen to look into this. (2) "To make a ship to go from all ships whatsoever." A note reads: "delivered by place to show to Mr. Barker and by the bearer concealed." (3) "To make a boat to go on the seas without sails or oars." A note reads: "invented by Rob. Stickells; and put in practice by Gowen Smithe." This is probably the Gawen Smith who had proposed, about 1580, the erection of a beacon on the Goodwin Sands.<sup>1</sup> These propositions are followed by the statement: "There is but one truth to do anything by whatsoever, to make a ship best weighed, or yarest<sup>2</sup> in her going. Examine these things in me and you shall find it to be true."

The second part of this paper, headed "Buildings for the land, not used", merely recapitulates the propositions in the first paper already outlined.

A perusal of these papers tends very strongly to the conclusion that Stickells was an obscurantist crank. Yet there may be a good deal more to be learnt from them and they have, at least, the peculiar interest of being the only evidences we have of the sort of philosophizings which went on in the head of an Elizabethan architect. One may hope that the publication of the documents may attract some student, better qualified than I in the literary and philosophical ideas of the Elizabethan age, to comment on Stickells' sources and his meaning.

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1547-1580, p. 700.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Tempest*, Act I, sc. i: "fall to't, yarely, or we run ourselves aground." The *O.E.D.* gives *yare*, "responsive to the helm".

## APPENDIX I

## WILL OF JOHN SYMONDS (P.C.C. COBHAM 61)

IN THE NAME OF GOD AMEN: The first daie of June Anno Domini 1597 and in the nine and thirteth yeare of the raigne of our soveraigne Ladie Elizabeth, by the grace of god Queene of England, France and Irelande, defender of the faith, &c. I, John Symandes citizen and Joyner of London beinge sicke in bodie yet nevertheles of good and perfett minde and remembrance laude and praise be therefore given to almightie god doe make and declare this my present Testament and last will in mannor and forme followeing (that is to saie) First and principallie I commend my soule into the handes of almightie god my maker Savio<sup>r</sup> and Redeemer in whome and by the meritts of the second person Jesus Christe I trust and believe assuredlie to be saved and to have full and cleare remission and forgiveness of all my sinnes and I commit my bodie to ye earth to be buried within the parishe church of St. Martin in the feilds in the county of Midd as neare unto the place where the bodie of my late wife Elizabeth Symandes lieth buried as convenientlie maie be and after my bodie buried then I will that all such debts and duties as I shall owe unto anie person or persons in right or in conscience shal be trulie paide. And that beinge done then I will all and singular my goodes chattells and debtes shal be devided into two equall indifferent partes and portions whereof one equall part I give and bequeath to and amonges my children hereafter named (that is to saie) to *John Robert and John Symandes* my sonnes, *Luce Saunce Johane and Elizabeth Symands* my daughters equallie amonges them to be devided portion and portionlike and to be paide and delivered to everie of my saide sonnes at such time as they and everie of them shall accomplishe and come to their lawfull ages of twentie and one yeeres and to everie of my saide daughters at such time as they and everie of them shall accomplishe and come to their lawfull ages of twentie and one yeeres or on the daies of their severall mariages, which shall first happen. And my will and minde is that everie of my saide children shal be heire to other of his her and their partes therein yf death shall happen to them or anie of them in the meane time. And thother equall part and portion thereof I reserve unto my sefe and to my Exe-cuto<sup>r</sup>s hereunder named therewith to paie and discharge the guiftes, Legacies and bequeastes in and by this my present Testam<sup>t</sup> and last will given and bequeathed (that is to saie) First I will that *Master Knight*, preacher and minister of St. Martins in the feildes aforesaide, shall make a sermon for me on the daie of my buriall and that he shall have for his paines tenne shillings. Item I give and bequeath unto *Jane Baker* my mother in law my wives best gowne her best peticoate her best kirtle of tuffed Taffeta, her velvet hatt her best neckercher with the gorgett and her Taffeta apron. Item I give and bequeath unto *Humfrey Baker* my father in lawe her husbände my second gowne beinge unmade up my satten coate my blacke cappe my jerkin of velvett, my velvett breeches, a peece of black satten of towres to make him a doblet and one of my hattes. Item I give and bequeath unto my brother *W<sup>m</sup>. Symandes* my third best gowne faced with damaske my jerkin of satten w<sup>th</sup>out sleeves garded about with two gardes of velvett, a paire of hosen w<sup>ch</sup> I made of a gowne which was my fathers a ierkin

of cloth a corner capp w<sup>ch</sup> was my fathers my best blacke coate laied on with silke lace my second best sattē doublett and my Geometricall instrument of wood called Jacobs staffe. And also the somme of tenne poundes of lawfull monie of England in ready monie. And I doe also cleirelie discharge and forgive my saide brother *William Symandes* of twelve poundes which he oweth me by vertue of an obligation and also of all other debtes duties and sommes of monie which he shall owe unto me at the time of my decease. And I also give unto my saide brother *William Symandes* one peice of orrenge tawney broade cloth containinge two or three yardes or thereabouts whereuppon he borrowed monie of me and I doe clerelie discharge him from the paiement thereof. Item I give and bequeath unto my brother *Robert Symandes* the somme of tenne poundes of lawfull monie of England in redie monie. And also my fouerth gowne faced with Budge and my second Taffeta hatt my grogaryne doblet beinge cut with small cutts and laied on with lace one paire of paned hosen of rashe with cannions of blacke satten my blacke cloake laied on with laces and my forrest bill. Item I give and bequeath to *John Symandes* my eldest sonne, my best blacke gowne weltd with velvett my blacke cloake faced with velvett my best satten doblett layd on with silke lace one paire of knives which was my fathers my best paire of paned breeches layed on w<sup>th</sup> lace and drawne out with Taffeta a paire of my best stockinges and my best hatt of sylke grograyne underturffed with velvett my silke girdle silke garters my waste girdle of velvett and my seale ring of golde and all my bookes whatsoever. And also I give unto him a sheete with an open seame and a greate brasse candlesticke which his norse at St. Albanes gave unto him. Item I give and bequeath unto *John Allen* somtyme my servant my sky collored gowne and my rugge gowne thone halfe of all my tooles belonginge to my occupation as well for free stone as for hard stone and thone halfe of all my platts my best case of yron compasses with all the other tooles in the same case, my finest pensell gilded which was my Mr. Stockettes and my Geometricall square of latten for measureinge of lande my backe sword and my second dagger my damaske Jackett with sleeves garded with velvet and my sylke grograyne doblett beinge cutt w<sup>th</sup> longe cuttes. Item I give and bequeath to *Andrew Weldon* my servant the other halfe of all my tooles belonginge to my occupation as well for free stone as for hard stone, my blew coate beinge mine when I was an apprentice a paire of my stockinges two yardes of tawney cloth which is in my chest to make him a coate, my doblett of rashe cloth laied on with lace my rideinge cloake beinge lined and my second arminge sworde. And I also give to the saide *Andrew Weldon* and to *William Wilson* freemason thother halfe of all my platts to be equallie devided betweene them. And I doe forgive and clerelie discharge the saide *Andrew Weldon* of the last year of his tearme of Apprentishood which he shall have to serve with me at the tyme of my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto my daughter *Saunce* her mothers second gowne, her second kirtle of Chamblett and her third neckercher with the gorgett to the same. Item I give and bequeath to *Mr. William Spicer* Comptroller of her Majesties workes my best case of latten Compasses and all other toles in the same case. Item I give and bequeath unto *Henrie Fadys Mathew Switzer* *William Partinton* *Cornelius Cure* the foresaid *Humfrey Baker* my father in lawe and to the foresaide *Jane his wife* my mother in lawe to *Margery Serch* wife of *William Search* Scrivenor *John Forde* servant to the saide *William Serch*



to *Gabriell Newman* and his wife to *Thomas Bickforde Smith* to the wife of my brother *William Symandes* to *Johane, wife of the foresaide John Allyn* to *John Thorpe* to *George Wilde* and to *Henrie Blader* Clerkes of the office of the Queenes Mat<sup>tes</sup> workes, to every of them a ringe of golde with a deathes heade in the same of the value of twentie shillings a peice for a remembrance. Item I give to *John Marshall* my best arminge sworde and the dagger to the same being both gilded. Item I will and my minde is that the foresaide *Jane Baker* my mother in lawe shall have the custodie and kepeinge for and dureinge all her naturall life of all my wives childe bedd Lynnen, and of all my wives golde ringes beinge eight in nomber. And after her decease I give and bequeath all the same child-bedd lynnen and all the same Ringes of golde to my children *Elizabeth Symandes*, *Robert Symandes* and *John Symandes*, my youngest sonne, equallie amoniges them to be devided. Item I give and bequeath the somme of fortie shillings to be given and distributed amoniges the *poorest inhabitantes* in the foresaide parishe of St. Martin in the feilds, where I am now a parishioner, on the day of my buriall. And I also give and bequeath for a [*Rencrion deleted*] or drinking to be had and made amongst the liverie of the *Companie of Joyners*, whereof I am a member, the somme of fortie shillings Soe as they doe attend uppon my bodie to the buriall. And I doe fullie and clearlie release and discharge the M<sup>r</sup> and wardens of the saide companie of Joyners of and from one obligation wherein they stande bounde unto me for the paiement of fiftie poundes which they doe owe unto me in consideration that I purchased the Joyners Hall with the appurtenances in London for my saide companie, which obligation I have delivered to Mr. Lutwiche Attorney of the court of comon plees, to be kept and delivered unto the said M<sup>r</sup> and Wardens ymmediatlie after my decease. Item I give and bequeath for a [*recreacon deleted*; *recreacon supplied in margin*] or drinking to be had and made amongse my fellow *officers of the Queenes Maiesties workes* and their wives fortie shillings and for a [*recreacon substituted for rencrion as before*] or drinking also to be had and made amongse *the cheifest and ancientest of my neighbours* three poundes. Item I give to and amoniges *ye children of my saide brother William Symandes* which he had by his seconde wife five poundes equallie amoniges them to be devided. Item I give and bequeath unto my cosen *Elianor Symandes* the somme of five poundes and to my nurse *Dolte* tenn shillings and to my nurse *Pedley* tenne shillings and to my nurse *Oledon* tenne shillings, and to my cosen *James Woodcoates wife* of Ratcliffe my wives Taffeta hatt with the gold bande. And I give and bequeath all my needle worke chushions to and amoniges *my three youngest children* equallie amoniges them to be devided. And I give and bequeath to and amoniges *all my saide seaven children* equallie amoniges them to be devided my ninetene sylver and guilt spoones, my three new white deepe sylver bolles and my new dobbell bell salte with a pepper box in the toppe thereof, to be delivered unto them at their saide ages of twentie and one yeares or daies of mariage. And if anie of them fortune to die in the meane time Then I will that the parte and portion of him her or them which shall soe fortune to die shal be and remaine to and amoniges the *Survivo<sup>rs</sup>* of them at their ages or daies of mariage foresaide. Item I give and bequeath unto the foresaide *Luce Symandes* my daughter her mothers third gowne and her second best neckercher with the gorgett to the same one white coveringe wrought with blewe. Item I give and bequeath unto the foresaide *Johane Symandes* my daughter her



mothers fouerth best neckercher with the gorgett and somuch new greenishe broade cloth as will make her a new gowne and my wives second best peticoate. The residue of my saide parte and portion remaineing to of and in my saide goodes chattells and debtes after the Legacies and bequeastes in and by this my last will and testament given and bequeathed performed paied and discharged accordinge to the true intent and meaninge of this my present Testament and last will I fullie and whollie give and bequeath to and amonges *all my seaven children* equallie amonges them to be devided and to be paied to my said sonnes at their saide ages of twentie one yeeres and to my saide daughters a theire saide ages of twentie one yeeres or daies of mariages which shall first happen as afore saide. And if it shall fortune anie of my saide children to decease before they shall accomlishe their said ages of twentie and one yeeres or daies of mariage as is aforesaide That then I will that the parte and portion of him her or them therein which shall fortune to decease shalbe paied and delivered unto the Survivo<sup>r</sup> and Survivo<sup>ts</sup> of them at their saide ages and daies of mariage as is aforesaide. And of the execution of this my present Testament and last will to see the same trulie performed as my especiall trust is in them I doe ordaine and make my cosyn *Mr. Richard Symandes Esquier* and the foresaide *William Serthe* my full and whole Executo<sup>rs</sup>. And I give to either of them for their paines therein to be taken fouer powndes a peece to buy them a ringe of golde. And Overseers of y<sup>e</sup> same to see the same trulie performed as my especiall trust is in them I ordaine and make my cosen *Thomas Symandes* of London marchant. The foresaide *Humfry Baker* my father in lawe and my loveinge frende *William Blande* of London Carpenter. And I give to every of them for their paines therein to be taken a ring of golde with a deathes heade of the value of three poundes a peece. In witnes whereof to this my present Testament and last will I the said John Symandes have sett my hande and seale the daie and yeare first above written per me John Symandes. Sealed and delivered in the presence of these personnes whose names been hereunder subscribed *T. Knight*, signum *Jacobi Waler*, signum *Richardi Baker*, and *John Forde* servant to William Serche aforesaide Scriveno<sup>r</sup>.  
Proved 21 June 1597

## APPENDIX II

## WILL OF ROBERT STICKELLS (P.C.C., SOAME 63)

IN THE NAME OF GOD AMEN. The sixe daye of May Anno Dni 1620, And in the Eighteenth years of the rainge of o<sup>r</sup> Sovereigne Lorde Kinge James, I Robert Stickells of the parish of St. Olaves in Southwark in the Countye of Surrey and Cittyzen and Freemason of London, beinge sicke of Body but of pfect mynde and remembraunce, prayse be to God doe heareby make and declare this my present last will and testament, in forme ensueing, That is to saye, first and especially I comitt my soule to God and to his sonne Jesus Christ my onely savio<sup>r</sup> and Redeemer. And my bodye to the Earth from whence it came, to bee interred and buried in Christian buryall, at the discrecon of my Executrix and Overseer heareunder named. And as concerninge my wordly estate, wch the

Lorde in his mercie hath endowed mee w<sup>th</sup>all, Item I give and bequeath unto the poore of the parish of St. Olaves aforesaid, where I nowe dwell, Five pounds. Item I give and bequeath unto my Cosen *John Bradley* five shillings. Item I give and bequeath to *Elizabeth Wynn* fyve shillings And to *her daughter Jane* five shillings. Item I give and bequeathe to *Rose* [blank in original] Twoe shillings and sixe pence. Item I give and bequeath unto the *wife of John Gardiner* my late wives best Gowne. Item I give and devise unto *John Weekes* five shillings of lawfull money of England and all my woollen wearinge aprell belonginge to my body. Item I give unto *Richard Grace*, the sonne of *Mathewe Grace*, all my Bookes and all my workinge tooles. Item I give and bequeath unto my freind *Thomas Luntley*, my muskett, head peice, and furniture thereunto belonginge. Item I give and bequeath unto *Robert Sherland*, my Petternell and case. And all the rest and residue of my Goods, Chattells, Debts, duties and demaundes whatsoever, I give and bequeath unto my maydservant *Katheryn Bowyer*. And I make and ordaine the sayde *Katherine Bowyer* sole Executrix of this my present last will, and Testament. And I nominate and appoint my lovinge freinds, the said *Mathewe Grace* and *Robert Sherland* Supervisors or Overseers thereof, preying them to see the same performed accordinge to the true intent and meaninge heareof. And I give unto them twenty shillings a peice for their paines. And all former willes I utterly renounce revoke and make frustrate, and these only to stand remayne and abyde in full force strengthe and effect

In witness whereof I the sayde Robert Stickells have hereunto sett my hand and seale. Dated the daie and yeare first above written. Rob. Stickelles. Sealed and delivered by the said Robert Stickells, as his last will, and testament, in the presence of us: John Freebody, Scr. per me Mathew Grace, Robert Sherland, John Gadyner.

Proved 1 June 1620

### APPENDIX III

Two papers by Robert Stickells (Lansd. 84, no. 10, i and ii). Paper i, endorsed "26 No. 1597 Stickelles ppotions", runs as follows:

Ppotions ppounded unto the  
Learned & skilfull;

- First, it wold be known (whether) the woorkes, moddarn; or the woorkes Antiques, is of most Effecte, & which of them, Contayn most Truthe; theay
- 1 both conset in all thinges livnge & being seprated; the one is sencable, the other insencable, no sencles thinge can be perfet, before by lif it be maid perfet:
  - 2 Secondle, ther is Apece of ground, to Build A manner house, upon; which contayneth in Length . 107 foot & in Breadth, 84 foot, now it woldebe known, howe high I might, I Build upon that ground, that I Build not to high, nor, too loe;

Thurdle, the Roumes or offices for that house upon that ground (before  
 3 Reherced) being contrived by just pporction ; then By the Breadth of the  
 Roume to geve the heayth, that the heayth be no mor, nor no Les then Just  
 pporction doth Requi<sup>r</sup>.

Forthle, havinge the Just heayth of the storis then to shewe how Beige or  
 4 howe thick the storie post or wauls, shal be that theay benot too beige nor  
 too Letell ;

Lastle, A shipe is too be Builte, of 300 Tones in Burden, searvesabl in all seas,  
 now it wold be knowne howe Beige, her kelle, Reibes, or Tembers, Beames,  
 wayles or Bendes, shalbe that no won part of them be to Beige nor to Letell ;

I shewe thes ppoctions to the ende I wolde have them exzamond, proved,  
 & tryed, by the Learned & Skilfull ; & for thes ppoctions Ill make  
 perfet demonstration ; fore that I see all Buildenges, grownded upon  
 the emperfect sence, the bookes of, Architecktur, victriuces & all thoos  
 Authers have, taken the wronge sense ; ther in wardes woorkes are dead  
 when theay shewe no lif in ther owtward Doweinges

Robert Stickelles

Paper ii has been endorsed " Robert Stickles—Recommended by y<sup>e</sup> Erl of  
 Derby for y<sup>e</sup> Office of Surveyor of her ma<sup>tys</sup> Woorkes ", but the last sentence is  
 struck through. Another hand has written : " Observations on y<sup>e</sup> proportion  
 of Buildings by Robert Stickles, recommended for y<sup>e</sup> Surveyorship of y<sup>e</sup> Queen<sup>s</sup>  
 Works, Sept. 1595." Another hand again has added " Devise of Buylding—  
 Stickles ". The text of the paper runs as follows :

Byldenges for the seas, not used.

In primies, To make a shippe shoot free & also fyer free, &c.

*In margin* : comanded by Hier Ma<sup>t</sup>, to take the vewe thereof, S<sup>r</sup> frances dracke.

Secondle, To make a shippe too goe from all shipes whatsoever, &c.

*In margin* : Delivered by place to shewe to Mr. Barker & by the bearear concealed.

Thurdle, To make a Bote too goe on the seas withe owt sales or ores &c.

*In margin* : Invented by Rob Stickeles ; & put in practis by Gowen Smithe.

Ther is but on truethe to doe a<sup>n</sup>y thinge by whatsoever, to make a shipe  
 beast wayed, or yarest in her goienge, &c. Exzam<sup>on</sup> thes thenges in me &  
 yow shall fynd it, To be True, &c.

knowenge what the Burden or To<sup>n</sup>age of the shippe shuldbe then to shewe by  
 proporction, the biggnes of the Kell, the beggnes of the Tembers, The beames,  
 walles, or bondinges, or if to begge, not good for the shipes waye, if too Letell,  
 not duerable but of short continuance, &c.

Byldinges for the lande, not used

For the byldinge of an howse of state, then to shewe by the quantite of the grownd  
 delyevred, howe hie I may bylde that I byld not to hie, nor to loe, &c.

And that by that quantite of grownd before rehearsed, the offices or Roumes  
 beinge contrived by due preporction, then by the breadthe, the heathe may be  
 geven that the lyght, shalbe no more, nor no less then nede shall Requiere, &c.

Then havenge the heathe of the storries, to shewe howe greate or howe  
 thicke the wales or postes shalbe, that the shall not be too begge, nor to lettell &c.

Thes thinges consisteth in man hime self, for that man is the proporctinall & Resonable creatuer, & therfor whatso is done witheowt thes Rules of proporction, is but unsearten matter, the seartayn have ther true quantites & measueres, & the unsearten, ar delivered throwe Ignorance, &c.

Thear ar too sortes of byldenges, the on in sence ; the other withowt sence ; The antikes in sence ; the moddarn witheout sence ; Because it is from cirkler demonstration, witheowt sence ; for that no cirkell Riseth in evenness of number, the antikes allwayes in evennes of nombre be cauese the ar derived from an Ichnographicall ground ; it the unevn may be broght into proporctions, as well as the even, &c.

Ther is no mor but Right & wronge in all thinges whatsoever, The sqear Right the cirkell wronge, &c.

Rob Stickells



# COPTIC AND ITS VALUE <sup>1</sup>

By WALTER C. TILL, DR. PHIL.

SENIOR LECTURER IN COPTIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER  
TIT. AO. PROFESSOR IN EGYPTOLOGY (VIENNA)

The harvest truly is great but the labourers are few. Matt. ix. 37; Luke x. 2.

THE Egyptian language, akin both to the Semitic and the Hamitic languages,<sup>2</sup> was written, from remote times, in hieroglyphs. In addition to characters representing a whole word there were phonetic signs for a single sound or a group of sounds. But in any case the hieroglyphs expressed whole words, not representing every single sound in a word. This system remained unchanged during the whole of the long period it was in use.

The fact that the Egyptian script wrote whole words only in connection with certain features of the Egyptian language, resulted in the development of signs for all consonants but no signs for the vowels. Nevertheless, any Egyptian text could be written in hieroglyphs and understood clearly by anybody knowing both the hieroglyphs and the Egyptian language.<sup>3</sup> But words of another language could be written only approximately in Egyptian hieroglyphs. This proved to be inconvenient in certain cases. Thus, for example, a spell could be expected to be effective only if it was executed exactly according to the directions. Above all, it was very important to pronounce in the proper way each word to be recited. In a spell there were often non-Egyptian words, names of demons and magic words. It was

<sup>1</sup> I can give here only an outline of this vast subject, trying to quote the latest literature. The reader interested in further details should consult *A Coptic Bibliography* compiled by W. Kammerer (Ann Arbor, 1950) and the periodical bibliography published by J. Simon in *Orientalia*, beginning N.S. 18 (Rome, 1949).

<sup>2</sup> The latest discussion of this question is to be found in E. Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik: Analecta orientalia*, vol. xxxiv (Rome, 1955), §§ 1-5.

<sup>3</sup> The latest discussion of this question will be found in W. Till, *Vom Wesen der ägyptischen Schrift: Die Sprache*, iii (Vienna, 1957), 207-15.

not possible to show the exact pronunciation of such words in the hieroglyphs or the systems developed from hieroglyphs : hieratic and demotic.

In order to avoid the evident inconvenience, writers began, in the second century A.D., to use Greek script, adopting characters from the vernacular (demotic) script for such sounds of the Egyptian language as did not exist in the Greek of that time, and for which, therefore, there were no letters in the Greek alphabet (sh, f, h, kh, ch = tsh, ky). We call words and texts written in this way " Old Coptic ",<sup>1</sup> because they are the forerunners of the Coptic way of writing. We call the Egyptian language " Coptic " beginning from the time (third century A.D.) when it is generally written in Coptic characters, that is to say, in Greek letters plus those additional characters mentioned above.

The Greek script lent itself readily to use by the Egyptians, because Egypt, since it was conquered by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C., was ruled by Greeks, the Ptolemies, for several centuries. Many Greek people, too, lived in Egypt, especially in the towns of Lower Egypt. And many Egyptians knew Greek and adopted Greek culture. So in course of time a large number of Greek expressions were incorporated in the Egyptian language. In consequence the Coptic language is of great interest and importance, not only as the last stage of development of a language we can trace through more than three millennia, but also for the Greek language as it was spoken in Egypt at that time.<sup>2</sup>

The nature of the " Old Coptic " texts makes it evident that the idea of writing Egyptian words and texts in Greek letters arose among non-Christians. But just at that time Christianity was readily adopted by the Egyptians. We may imagine the development in the following way. The new creed appealed

<sup>1</sup> " Copt " goes back to Arabic *ḳibt*, which is derived from Greek *αἰγύπτιος*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. L. Th. Lefort, " Le copte source auxiliaire du grec ", *L'Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales*, ii (Brussels, 1933/4), 589-78 ; L. Th. Lefort, " Greco-copte ", *Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute*, ii (Boston, 1950), 65-71 ; W. A. Girgis, *Greek words in Coptic usage* (Thesis for the degree of Ph.D., Manchester, 1955). A. Böhlig has made it his business to deal with the Greek words in Coptic. So far there has appeared *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament : Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Ägyptens*, 2 and 2a (Munich, 1953/4).

at first to the Greek people and to those Egyptians who understood Greek. Therefore the Greek texts of the Scriptures could be used in teaching and at divine service. But after a while Egyptian country people also, who did not understand Greek, adopted the Christian faith. In the course of the third century it was necessary to translate the Scriptures into the Egyptian language of that time. At first this was done by word of mouth only. After a passage had been read in Greek, an interpreter translated it into Egyptian.<sup>1</sup> It stands to reason that the Greek texts were translated into the colloquial language of the hearers. The literary Egyptian language of that time, written in demotic script, was a traditional language imitating old prototypes, and was already rather different from the spoken language. Only people who had a literary education understood it. Therefore the Scriptures had to be translated into colloquial Egyptian, and this language was used also when the Egyptian versions of the Scriptures were written down. In this way the colloquial language became a literary language. The translation was written in Greek characters, adding those additional letters mentioned above.

The Egyptian colloquial language became the literary language of the rapidly spreading Christianity of Egypt. Hence it was standardized, and we call it Coptic in that form.<sup>2</sup> Not only the Christians used the new Coptic language to translate their religious texts, but also the Gnostics and the Manichaeans.

The Egyptian language was spoken over a very extensive area, from the sea-coast in the north at least as far up as the first cataract of the Nile (near the modern town Asswân). It is evident that the language could not be exactly the same in all parts of the country. It had dialects from an early period. It is difficult to recognize the dialects in the old language as it was written in hieroglyphs depicting whole words. Besides, the written language was uniform at any one time. But as soon as the colloquial language was written in Greek characters the different dialects can be clearly seen.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O. H. E. KHS-Burmester, in *Biblica*, xiv (Rome, 1933), 453 f.

<sup>2</sup> W. E. Crum, *A Coptic dictionary* (Oxford, 1939). The latest grammar is W. Till, *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1955).

So far we know five dialects of the Coptic language. Sahidic soon became the general literary language in Coptic Egypt and is the classical form of Coptic. At a certain time the monastery of St. Macarius in the Wadi el-Natrun played a prominent part in electing the Coptic patriarchs. Therefore Bohairic, the dialect spoken in that part of the country, was the language of the patriarch and spread all over the country. Finally it became, and still is, the only form of the Coptic language used in the Coptic Church. Apart from these two main dialects there were some local dialects in use: Fayyumic was spoken in the Fayyûm; Akhmimic is supposed to have been spoken in Akhmîm (Upper Egypt) and its area; Subakhmimic is supposed to have been the language of Assiût (Upper Egypt) and its surroundings.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, there is a number of mixed dialects.

As we see from the reports of the early persecutions of Christians, Christianity was widespread in Egypt in the third century. The coincidence of different circumstances entailed, in early times, a strong trend among the Egyptians to withdraw from the world and live as anchorites in the desert. St. Antony, who was born in the middle of the third century and had become an anchorite in his youth, organized the anchorites who gathered round him, in A.D. 305. The organization was very loose. The anchorites came together on Saturdays and Sundays for common service, but for the rest of the time everybody lived as they pleased. The main point for them was to live as ascetically as possible. They generally showed no interest in developing a higher spirituality. Such communities of anchorites were called *laurae*.<sup>2</sup>

In 318 Pachôm established the first monastery for monks at Tabennêse (near Akhmîm in Upper Egypt). The rush to this community was so great that soon more monasteries were

<sup>1</sup> J. Simon, "L'aire et la durée des dialectes coptes". *Actes du quatrième Congrès International de Linguistes, Copenhague 1936* (Copenhague, 1938), pp. 182-6. Cf. W. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik* (Munich, 1931); M. Chaîne, *Éléments de grammaire dialectale copte* (Paris, 1933); id. *Les dialectes coptes assioutiques A*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1934); W. H. Worrell, *Coptic Sounds* (Ann Arbor, 1934), pp. 63-82; P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah* (London, 1954), pp. 193-257.

<sup>2</sup> The literature about the origin and development of monasticism is vast and can easily be found in bibliographies and reference books.



established. In 345 there were eight monasteries with about 700 monks in them. Also convents for nuns were established.

Pachôm organized the life of his monks in every detail according to rules which he wrote in Coptic. These monasteries were called *coenobia*. They united the monks in a common cultural and economic life, with a firm organization. Each monk had to earn his livelihood by carrying on a craft.

Other monasteries with different organizations were established in Egypt. Their rules imitate those of Pachôm, so far as we can see. The monastic life was soon adopted by the other Christian countries. The life of the Egyptian monks was, and still is, the model for all Christian monks.<sup>1</sup> Egypt has become the cradle of Christian monasticism.

The monasteries were the upholders of civilization in Christian Egypt. Most people who were able to write were priests or monks. This circumstance resulted in Coptic literature being almost exclusively of a religious character.<sup>2</sup>

As in the northern part of Egypt there were many Greeks, and many Egyptians understood Greek there, we may suppose that the need to translate the Bible into Egyptian was first felt in Upper Egypt. In fact the oldest Coptic manuscripts are from Upper Egypt. If we have literary manuscripts from Lower Egypt in large numbers only from the ninth century onwards, we must not deduce from that fact that no manuscripts were written in Lower Egypt before the ninth century. Most of the manuscripts were in the monasteries. And these were constantly being destroyed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. H. Bacht, *Vom gemeinsamen Leben: Die Bedeutung des pachomianischen Mönchsideals für die Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums: Liturgie und Mönchtum*, 3. Folge, xi (Abtei Maria Laach, 1952), 91-110.

<sup>2</sup> J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte der koptischen Literatur: Geschichte der christlichen Literaturen des Orients*, 2. Aufl. (Leipzig, 1909); A. Baumstark, *Die koptische Literatur: Die christlichen Literaturen des Orients*, i (Leipzig, 1911, Sammlung Göschen 527), 106 ff.; S. Morenz, *Die koptische Literatur: Handbuch der Orientalistik*, i (Leiden, 1952), 207-19; articles in many reference books. A monograph on Coptic sermons has been written by C. D. J. Müller, *Die alte koptische Predigt* (Berlin, 1954). H. Hyvernat, "Egypt V. Coptic literature", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, v (New York, 1909), 356-63, xvi (1914), 27-30; De Lacy O'Leary, "Littérature copte", *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, vol. ix, no. 2 (Paris, 1930), 1599-1635; Sir Stephen Gaselee, "The native literature of Christian Egypt", *Trans. Roy. Soc. Literature*, ser. 2, xxxiii (1915), 21-45.

in Lower Egypt until the ninth century. This is why old literary texts from Lower Egypt are so extremely rare.

We do not possess Coptic versions of all the books of the Old Testament. There is no Sahidic version of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Maccabees. There is no Bohairic version of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Esther, Judith, Tobit and Maccabees. We know only passages inserted into liturgical texts from the following books (in Bohairic): Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus (= Jesus ben Sirach).

The best documentary evidence we have is of the Psalms, as they played an important part in the liturgy. They belonged to the books of the Scriptures which were learned by heart. As for the Odes following the Psalms, I have indicated all the published Coptic versions in my edition of a Vienna manuscript of the Odes.<sup>1</sup>

There is not yet a modern scientific edition of the Coptic versions of the books of the Old Testament as far as they are extant.<sup>2</sup> Up to now nearly all editions of Coptic versions of

<sup>1</sup> W. Till and P. Sanz, *Eine griechisch-koptische Odenhandschrift: Monumenta biblica et ecclesiastica*, vol. v (Rome, 1939).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. H. Hallock, "The Coptic Old Testament", *American Journ. Semitic languages*, xlix (1932/33), 325-35. Large parts of the Sahidic version of books of the Old Testament are found in the following publications: A. Ciasca, *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1885 and 1889); G. Maspero, "Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament", *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologiques française au Caire*, vol. vi, no. 1 (Paris, 1892); E. A. W. Budge, *Biblical texts in the dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1912) (Deuteronomy, Jonah); P. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca* (Göttingen, 1883) (Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus ben Sirach); Sir Herbert Thompson, *The Coptic (Sahidic) version of certain books of the Old Testament* (Oxford-London, 1908) (Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus ben Sirach); id. *A Coptic palimpsest* (Oxford-London, 1911) (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith, Esther); W. H. Worrell, *The Coptic manuscripts of the Freer Collection: University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic series*, vol. x (New York, 1923) (Psalter, Job); id. *The Proverbs of Solomon in Sahidic Coptic according to the Chicago manuscript: The University of Chicago, Oriental Institute Publications*, vol. xii (Chicago, 1931); E. Amélineau, "The Sahidic translation of the book of Job." *Trans. Soc. Biblical archaeology*, ix (1893), 405-75; L.-A. Shier, in *Coptic texts in the University of Michigan Collection: University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic series*, vol. xlvi (Ann Arbor, 1942) (Genesis, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Jeremiah, Baruch); E. A. W. Budge, *The earliest known Coptic Psalter* (London, 1898); A. Rahlfs, *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters: Abhandlungen der kgl. Ges. d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*,

parts of the Old Testament contain the text only without a critical apparatus.

As Coptic versions of books of the Old Testament are comparatively rare <sup>1</sup> in the main dialects, we are not surprised to find that it is much worse in the minor dialects.

We have an early (fifth century) manuscript of the Akhmimic version of the Minor Prophets. It is divided between the Papyrus collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.<sup>2</sup> Apart from this manuscript we have parts of Genesis, Exodus, Daniel <sup>3</sup> and 2 Maccabees in Akhmimic.<sup>4</sup> A. Böhlig is about to publish the complete Akhmimic version of the Proverbs.

*philol.-hist. Kl.*, n. F. vol. iv, No. 4 (Berlin, 1901); C. Wessely, *Sahidisch-griechische Psalmenfragmente: Sitzungsberichte d. kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Kl.*, vol. clv, no. 1 (Vienna, 1907).

The complete texts of the Bohairic version of some books of the Old Testament are edited in the following publications: P. de Lagarde, *Der Pentateuch koptisch* (Leipzig, 1867). The Coptic association "Abnaa el-Kanisa" in Cairo has begun to publish the Bohairic Pentateuch: (Coptic title) *Piçôm etwab. Tidiathêkê napas* (= The Holy Book. The Old Testament) (Cairo, 1939). An Arabic translation is added. So far Genesis and Exodus only have been published. O. H. E. Burmester and E. Dévaud, *Psalterii versio memphitica* (Louvain, 1925); H. Tattam, *The ancient Coptic version of the book of Job the Just* (London, 1846); E. Porcher, "Le livre de Job, version copte bohairique", *Patrologia orientalis*, vol. xviii, no. 2 (Paris, 1924); H. Tattam, *Doudecim prophetarum minorum libros* . . . (Oxford, 1836); H. Tattam, *Prophetas maiores* . . . (Oxford, 1852); A. Bsiai, *Liber Baruch prophetae* (Rome, 1870); M. Kabis, "Das Buch Baruch koptisch", *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, vols. x-xii (Leipzig, 1872-4); O. H. E. Burmester and E. Dévaud, *Les proverbes de Salomon: Texte bohairique* (Vienna, 1930).

<sup>1</sup> Extremely valuable lists of all Coptic versions of biblical texts have been compiled by A. Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible", *Revue biblique* (Paris, 1919-22) for the Sahidic versions. *Le Muséon*, vol. xliii (Louvain, 1930) and vol. xlv (1932) for the Bohairic versions. *Le Muséon*, vol. xlvi (1933), 299-313 for the minor dialects. Since these lists were published some more Coptic biblical texts have come to light.

<sup>2</sup> Latest editions: (the Vienna leaves) W. Till, *Die achmimische Version der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Codex Rainerianus, Wien): *Coptica*, iv (Copenhagen, 1927); (the Paris leaves) M. Malinine, *Fragment d'une version achmimique des Petits Prophètes: Coptic Studies in honor of Walter Euing Crum* - *Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute*, ii (Boston, 1950), 365-415.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. iii. 50-5. L. Amundsen, *Christian papyri from the Oslo Collection. Symbolae Osloenses*, xxiv (1945), 121-40.

<sup>4</sup> Apart from the publications mentioned in Vaschalde's list (n. 1, p. 235), L. Th. Lefort in *Le Muséon*, lxvi (Louvain, 1953), 1-15.



In Fayyumic we have larger or smaller portions of Exodus, Numbers, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, the Epistle of Jeremiah, Susanna and Daniel.<sup>1</sup> A. Kropp is hoping to edit an important manuscript containing parts of the Fayyumic version of the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes.

The Sahidic and Bohairic versions of the New Testament have been published in full. Unfortunately there are only a few manuscripts containing the complete Sahidic version of one of the New Testament books. Most of them are only fragments. When G. Horner compiled his edition of the Sahidic version of the New Testament<sup>2</sup> he had to piece together the texts from many fragments. These fragments are very different in age and value. Therefore Horner's edition cannot show a homogeneous text. The text of the Gospels, for example, had to be pieced together from 151 fragments of different manuscripts from the period between the fifth and the fourteenth centuries. One must always bear this fact in mind when using Horner's edition of the Sahidic version of the New Testament for textual criticism.

Since Horner's edition was published the case has improved for some parts of the New Testament. The British collector A. Chester Beatty possesses three Coptic manuscripts of a small size which were written about A.D. 600. One of these manuscripts contains the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel according to John. Another contains the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel according to John again. The third contains a part of the Psalms. Sir Herbert Thompson has edited the Acts and the Pauline Epistles according to these manuscripts.<sup>3</sup> These texts, of course, give a homogeneous recension.

Anyone wishing to use the Sahidic version of the New Testament for textual criticism must consider every fragment individually. For this Vaschalde's list (n. 1, p. 235) is indispensable. Perhaps my catalogue of the fragments of the Coptic versions of

<sup>1</sup> After Vaschalde's list (n. 1, p. 235): W. Till, *Koptische Pergamente theologischen Inhalts*, 1: *Mittelungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. ii (Vienna, 1934), 21 ff.; id. in *Le Muséon*, xlix (Louvain, 1936), 172-87.

<sup>2</sup> *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the southern dialect*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1911-24), with an English translation.

<sup>3</sup> *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic dialect* (Cambridge, 1932).



the Bible in the Papyrus collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna <sup>1</sup> may be considered as a small contribution to this task.

For the Bohairic version of the New Testament the situation is much better. There is a number of manuscripts containing the complete texts of books of the New Testament, but all are comparatively late. We owe the edition of the Bohairic version of the New Testament also to G. Horner.<sup>2</sup>

As far as the minor dialects are concerned, till now only one manuscript of considerable importance has come to light. It contains the Subakhmimic version of the Gospel of John.<sup>3</sup> Parts of the same Gospel (chiefly chapters x-xiii) and nearly the whole text of the Epistle of James are extant in the Akhmimic dialect.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, considerable parts of the Gospel of Luke,<sup>5</sup> and small parts of the Gospel of Matthew (xi., 25-30) <sup>6</sup> and the Epistle of Jude (17-20) <sup>7</sup> have been edited.

A little more has come to light in the Fayyumic dialect: considerable parts of all four Gospels, the Epistle to the Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Hebrews, smaller parts of the Epistles of James, 1 Peter and 1 Timothy.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien: Katalog der koptischen Bibelbruchstücke: Die Pergamente: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xxxix (Berlin, 1941), 1-57.

<sup>2</sup> *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the northern dialect*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1898-1905), with an English translation.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Herbert Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John* (London, 1924).

<sup>4</sup> Edited by Fr. Rösch in *Bruchstücke des I. Clemensbriefes* (Strassburg, 1910); W. E. Crum in *Coptic manuscripts brought from the Fayyum* (London, 1893), pp. 2 ff.; W. Till in *Le Muséon*, li (1938), 69-71.

<sup>5</sup> L. Th. Lefort, in *Le Muséon*, lxvi (Louvain, 1953), 16-30.

<sup>6</sup> L. Amundsen, cf. n. 3, p. 235. <sup>7</sup> W. E. Crum, cf. n. 4, p. 237).

<sup>8</sup> Apart from the texts listed by Vaschalde (n. 1, p. 235) the following parts of the Fayyumic New Testament have been published by the writer of the present article: In *Koptische Pergamente* (cf. n. 1, p. 236): Matt. xv. 13, 14, 17-19; Marc. vi. 16, 17, 28-30; xv. 29-31, 33-4; 1 Cor. xv. 57-xvi. 2. In *Le Muséon*, xlix (1936), 187 ff.; Marc. iv. 15-17, 20-2, 26-9, 32-4; John ix. 19, 20, 24; xvi. 32; xvii. 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14; xvi. 25-7, 32-3; Rom. v. 15-18; xiv. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 43-7, 57, 58; xvi. 1, 2; Heb. x. 26-32; 1 Pet. ii. 11-13, 20-3; v. 2-8; 2 Tim. iii. 13-17; iv. 2, 3, 6-10. P. E. Kahle could identify a few very fragmentary passages published in that place. These are K 2862 (p. 191) = Matt. xvii. 6, 7, 11, 12; K 8691 (p. 195) = James i. 21-6; K 3280 (p. 201) = 1 Cor. xv. 29, 32; K 54 (p. 210) = John ii. 24-iii. 2; K 13 (p. 211) flesh

One final word may be useful for those who wish to make use of the Coptic versions of the Bible for textual criticism. In doing so the peculiarities of the Coptic language must always be borne in mind. If, for example, in the Coptic version there is sometimes an equivalent for the Greek *καί*, sometimes not, this is by no means always due to a variant but very often to the fact that in Coptic an expression meaning "and" (there are three) is used or not used according to principles entirely different than in Greek. The same holds good for the article and the possessive. Moreover, it cannot be expected that the Coptic version will always accurately represent the tenses and moods of the Greek verbs or that these will always be translated in the same way. This is impossible because the very rich means of expression of the Coptic verb have developed in an entirely different way from the Greek. The forms of the Coptic conjugation have quite different values of meaning. Therefore it is often impossible for the Coptic translator to find exact Coptic equivalents for the Greek tenses and moods. He must often choose amongst several possibilities of which none translates exactly the Greek form of the verb. That is why the Coptic version is always, to a certain degree, an interpretation by the translator. Moreover, the rules for the arrangement of the words in a Coptic sentence are different from those in Greek.

These are only a few hints. But they are sufficient to show that it is often impossible even for one who knows Coptic to decide with certainty whether a difference between the Greek text and its Coptic translation is due to the peculiarity of the Coptic language or to a true variant of the Greek text. This makes it evident that only those who understand Coptic are able to use the Coptic versions for textual criticism. No translation, be it as literal as those of Horner's editions can be a substitute for knowledge of the Coptic language. Such translations may even mislead those who do not know Coptic.

The Coptic versions of the biblical texts often have been used for textual criticism. The literature in this field is quite extensive.

side (from a lectionary) = Matt. xviii. 22. In *Le Muséon*, li (1938), 227 ff. : Matt. i. 15-20 ; Marc. xv. 43-xvi. 7 ; John iv. 3-14. In *BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY*, xxxiv (1952), 453 f. : Rom. xi. 30-5 ; xii. 1-3.

The latest excellent summary was published by W. Grossouw,<sup>1</sup> who cites the literature.

It may be said that generally the Coptic versions represent a text which is at an earlier stage of development than the Greek texts known to us. It is precisely this fact which gives the Coptic versions their value for textual criticism.

In the field of the Old Testament some special investigations have been devoted to the Coptic texts.<sup>2</sup> Thus, for instance, H. S. Gehman dealt with the Coptic version of Daniel,<sup>3</sup> A. Böhlig with that of the Proverbs,<sup>4</sup> W. Grossouw with that of the Minor Prophets<sup>5</sup> and the present writer with the Wisdom of Solomon.<sup>6</sup>

The authors mentioned agree in stating that the Bohairic version is later than, and was made independently of, the Sahidic version. Both translate Greek texts which, similar though they are to each other, yet differ in some details. The aim of the translators was not to produce a version as literal as possible but a text which could readily be understood by Coptic readers. They used every means which seemed to them capable of serving their purpose: simplifications, abbreviations, additions, transformations, interpretations; in short they made use of every liberty in order to render the text clear to the Coptic readers. Later the Coptic versions were corrected in some passages by comparison with one another and with Greek texts.

The Bohairic version of the Proverbs is an exception to this. Its translator endeavoured to produce a version as literal as possible.

We have two early manuscripts containing the Sahidic version of the Wisdom of Solomon. No Bohairic version of this book has so far come to light. But the Bohairic liturgy of Holy Week contains some passages of this book. It is evident that the two

<sup>1</sup> *De Koptische bijbelvertalingen: Studia catholica*, ix (Nijmegen, 1933), 325-53.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the literature mentioned by W. Grossouw (n. 1, p. 239).

<sup>3</sup> "The Sahidic and the Bohairic Version of the Book of Daniel", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xli (New Haven, 1927), 279-330.

<sup>4</sup> *Untersuchungen über die koptischen Proverbientexte* (Stuttgart, 1936).

<sup>5</sup> *The Coptic versions of the Minor Prophets: Monumenta biblica et ecclesiastica*, vol. iii (Rome, 1938).

<sup>6</sup> "Die koptischen Versionen der Sapientia Salomonis", *Biblica*, xxxvi (Rome, 1955), 51-70.

Sahidic manuscripts contain two independent translations of the same Greek recension.

Daniel, the Proverbs, and Wisdom are texts which the Coptic translators understood thoroughly (with the exception of a few passages only). Therefore the translations are generally correct. But this is not the case with all Old Testament texts. There are, for example, many passages in the Greek texts of the books of the Prophets which the Coptic translators obviously could not understand. Nevertheless they did their best to translate such passages even if the translation is meaningless.<sup>1</sup>

According to Grossouw (n. 5, p. 239) the Bohairic version of the Minor Prophets generally follows the Hesychian text, but behind this we can see the influence of an older text. The Akhmimic version is translated from a Sahidic text as I have shown in my edition (n. 2, p. 235). Therefore it is of the same type as the Sahidic version. It is striking that approximately 200 passages of the Sahidic and the Akhmimic versions translate rather the Hebrew text than the Greek *textus receptus* of the LXX. D. Barthélemy has shown that the missing link is a recently discovered Greek text which is not yet published.<sup>2</sup>

The Coptic version of the Psalms is remarkable for some distinctly Christian additions.<sup>3</sup> The Bohairic version of Ps. 37, 21c adds "and they drove nails into my flesh". This is not found elsewhere. But the addition to Ps. 95, 10a: "from the (or a, respectively) wood" is found in both the Sahidic and the Bohairic versions.

The Bohairic version of the Psalms is later than the Sahidic and translates a different Greek recension. But there are corrections according to the Sahidic version, for it agrees in some passages with the Sahidic text where this differs from the Greek.

<sup>1</sup> As a striking example of how this is done the Akhmimic version of *ἐσται κύριος εἰς καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν* (Zach. xiv. 9) may be quoted. In this case the Sahidic version was translated but misunderstood. The Akhmimic version of this passage means: "The Lord will become a head, and his name (will become) a head." Cf. my edition quoted in n. 2, p. 235, p. xxx.

<sup>2</sup> "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante", *Revue Biblique*, lx (Paris, 1953), 18-29.

<sup>3</sup> A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta Societatis Gottingensis auctoritate*, x, *Psalmi* (Göttingen, 1931), 27 ff.



Unlike the Coptic versions of the books of the Old Testament all the Coptic versions of the New Testament try to translate the Greek text as literally as possible. We may take it for granted that at first several translations were made independently of each other. The Greek texts which were translated into Coptic were very similar to each other, but at any rate older than the oldest Greek texts we know. This fact gives a high importance to the Coptic versions of the New Testament.

Later, the versions which were independent at first were corrected from one another.<sup>1</sup>

Coptic piety did not feel much need of profound philosophical treatises. The Egyptian people enjoyed, from of old, fantastic stories, and so they preferred, in Christian times, legends rich in reports of miracles. Therefore, next to the Bible, apocryphal texts were of a high importance for the religious life of the Egyptian Christians. We owe to W. Grossouw a valuable outline of this kind of religious literature, which is very widespread in Coptic.<sup>2</sup> Christ, the Apostles, and other figures in most of these stories have the characteristics of powerful magicians. Originally such stories were translated into Coptic. But we may suppose that later on new stories of the same kind and in the same style were written in Coptic. They contain many pre-Christian autochthonous elements, and give a vivid picture of the faith of the Christian Egyptians and of the social life of that time. Even heathen and Gnostic elements are found in these stories. Some of these texts are known in Coptic only.

Most of the apocrypha of the Old Testament are transmitted in a Christian recension, and therefore are of little value for the study of the original Jewish texts. We know only in a Coptic version, for example, the Apocalypse of Elias<sup>3</sup> which goes back to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. L. Koole, "Studien zum koptischen Bibeltext", *Beiheft xvii zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Berlin, 1936), 97 ff. Koole deals with the Pauline Epistles.

<sup>2</sup> "De apocriefen van het Oude en Nieuwe Testament in de Koptische letterkunde", *Studia catholica*, x (Nijmegen, 1934), 434-46; ib. xi (1934), 19-33. I do not quote here the literature mentioned in these articles. Cf. F. H. Hallock, "Coptic apocrypha", *Journal of Biblical literature*, lii (1933), 163-74.

<sup>3</sup> G. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, n.F. vol. ii, no. 3a (= 17) (Leipzig, 1899).

an old Jewish composition, but is now worked up in a Christian sense; for example, it deals, among other things, with the appearance of the Antichrist. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah<sup>1</sup> is an eschatological treatise dealing chiefly with the different punishments in Hell.

We know the complete Bohairic versions of the wills of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.<sup>2</sup> The Odes of Solomon are found in the Gnostic text *Pistis Sophia* (cf. n. 3, p. 251). The Coptic versions of Daniel and Jeremiah contain apocryphal additions.

The apocryphal writings of the New Testament are far more abundant. There are some unidentified fragments of Gospel stories. To these belong stories about the life and death of Joseph and Mary.<sup>3</sup> Among these are some long texts with many genuine Egyptian features. Such subjects are dealt with also in some homilies which we have in Coptic. Moreover, the Passion and Resurrection of Christ is the subject of apocryphal texts. We do not know texts of which these Coptic writings are direct translations. Therefore it is possible that some of them are free treatments of these subjects.

Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles<sup>4</sup> are extremely abundant in Coptic. The older group was composed before A.D. 300 and emphasizes the teaching of the Apostles. The Acts of Paul<sup>5</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> G. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, n.F. vol. ii, no. 3a (= 17) (Leipzig, 1899).

<sup>2</sup> I. Guidi, in *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Rendiconti, Classe di scienze morali* . . . , ser. 5, ix (1900), 157-80, 223-64. German translation by E. Andersson, in *Sphinx*, vi (1903), 220-36; vii (1903), 77-94, 129-42.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. F. Robinson, *Coptic apocryphal Gospels. Texts and Studies*, vol. iv, no. 2 (Cambridge, 1896). Texts with English translation. S. Morenz, *Die Geschichte von Josef, dem Zimmermann: Texte* (as in n. 3, p. 241), xliii (Leipzig, 1919).

<sup>4</sup> I. Guidi, *Frammenti copti: Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Rendiconti, Classe di scienze morali* . . . , ser. 4, vol. iii, no. 1 (1887), 47-63; vol. iii, no. 2, 19-35, 65-81, 177-90, 251-70, 368-84; vol. iv, no. 1 (1888), 60-70. Italian translation: I. Guidi, "Gli atti apocrifi degli apostoli nei testi copti, arabi ed etiopici", *Giornale della Società asiatica italiana*, ii (Florence, 1888), 1-66; O. v. Lemm, "Koptische apokryphe Apostelacten", *Bulletin de l'Académie imp. des sciences de St. Pétersbourg (Mélanges asiatiques)*, 10 (1890), 99-171; (1892), 293-386.

<sup>5</sup> C. Schmidt, *Acta Pauli*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1905).

the Acts of Peter <sup>1</sup> belong to this older group. Of both of them the original Greek texts are unknown.

Most of the texts of the later group were written in the fifth and sixth centuries. They are stories of miracles and are more in the nature of folklore than of theology. These stories were very popular and had great influence on pictorial art and literature.

These secondary Acts of the Apostles used older material. The Acts of Peter and Paul, and the Acts of John of Pseudo-Prochoros belong to this group. The older texts of this group are very free translations from Greek texts. Others seem to have been written in Coptic imitating a Greek text, for example, the Acts of Philip, the Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew, the Acts of Judas Thaddaeus.

Apocryphal letters were not so popular, therefore they are much rarer. An early manuscript (fourth-fifth century) contains large parts of a Coptic text called *Epistula Apostolorum*, of which we have a complete Ethiopic version.<sup>2</sup> It is an alleged encyclical letter of the eleven Apostles to all Christian Churches and was perhaps composed as early as the second century. Christ answers questions of the Apostles about the resurrection of the flesh, the judgement, salvation and the like.

One apocryphal letter is very common in Coptic. This is Christ's letter to Abgar, King of Edessa.<sup>3</sup> The reason for its frequency is the promise of protection for any place where a copy is kept.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> C. Schmidt, *Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der Apostelliteratur nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment*. Texte (as in n. 3, p. 241), vol. xxiv, no. 1 (1903).

<sup>2</sup> C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung: Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. xliii (Leipzig, 1919).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E. v. Dobschütz, "Briefwechsel zwischen Abgar und Jesus", *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, xliii (1900), 445 ff.; M. Bittner, *Der vom Himmel gefallene Brief Christi in seinen morgenländischen Versionen und Rezensionen: Denkschriften der Kaisl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, philos.-hist. Kl. vol. li, no. 1 (Vienna, 1905).

<sup>4</sup> Editions of such texts not mentioned by Grossouw (n. 2, p. 241) are: B. A. Turajev, *Koptskija ostraka kollekcii W. S. Goleniščeva: Izučestija Imp. Akademii Nayk* (1899), vol. x, no. 5, p. 436; V. Stegemann, *Die Koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer in Wien: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philos.-hist. Kl., Jg. 1933/4, 1. Abhandlung (Heidelberg, 1934), nos. 26 and 50; W. Till, *Die nicht-katalogisierten Coptica*

The predilection for fantastic instructions explains the large number of apocalypses in Coptic. One of the oldest texts of this kind, composed in Greek, is the Apocalypse of St. Paul, which was translated into all languages of the Mediterranean countries. Heaven and Hell, especially the tortures of the sinners, are described and explained.

The rest of the compositions of this kind are later and known only in Coptic. In "the Mysteries of the virgin Apostle John"<sup>1</sup> we see St. John being shown round in Heaven. The explanation the angel guide gives him are of great interest from the point of view of folk-lore. The revelations of James the Brother of the Lord deal with St. John the Baptist<sup>2</sup> and his acting as ferryman in the third Heaven, transporting the blessed souls of the dead across the river of fire, which every soul, righteous or sinner, must cross when going to the other world. In a book about Abbaton, the angel of death,<sup>3</sup> we are told of the creation of man out of clay, man's life in Paradise, his fall, and the installation of the angel of death.

The oldest text of the Church Order known to us is its Coptic version.<sup>4</sup> These instructions regulate Church life and are said to be given by the Apostles themselves. The text contains the so-called Apostolic Church Order, a recension of the Church Order of Hippolytus of Rome,<sup>5</sup> and an extract from the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions.

*der John Rylands Library: Das Antiquariat*, viii (Vienna, 1952), 89; Yassa 'Abd el-Masîh, "An unedited Bohairic letter of Abgar", *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, liv (Cairo, 1954), 13-43.

<sup>1</sup> E. A. W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1913), pp. 59-74 (text) and 241-57 (translation, which is not always reliable).

<sup>2</sup> E. A. W. Budge, *ibid.*, pp. 128-45 and 335-51.

<sup>3</sup> E. A. W. Budge, *Coptic martyrdoms, etc., in the dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1914), pp. 225-49 and 474-96.

<sup>4</sup> There are also Latin, Arabic and Ethiopic versions. Cf. P. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca* (Göttingen, 1883), pp. 209-91 (the Sahidic version without a translation). Later on the Sahidic text was translated into Bohairic: H. Tattam, *The Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles, in Coptic with an English translation* (London, 1848); G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici* (London, 1904), with English translation.

<sup>5</sup> W. Till und J. Leipoldt, *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts* (with German translation). *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. lviii (Berlin, 1954).



Moreover there are Coptic versions of acts of the Councils,<sup>1</sup> canons,<sup>2</sup> writings of the Apostolic Fathers<sup>3</sup> and the Fathers of the Church, as, for example, Peter of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Epiphanius,<sup>4</sup> Athanasius<sup>5</sup> and others. The fact that many parts of these texts are known only in Coptic gives the Coptic versions a special value.

We know also letters which were written in Coptic, as, for example, of Pachôm and his successors, Theodore and Horsîêse,<sup>6</sup> of Shenute, the second abbot of the "White Monastery" near Sohâg in Upper Egypt, and his successor Bêsa.<sup>7</sup> All these letters were written for an immediate purpose.

Shenute (+ A.D. 451) surpassed by far the rest of the writers mentioned. We know not only a large number of letters, but also of sermons and other speeches of his.<sup>8</sup> He expresses his opinion in a plain, unvarnished, impulsive way. His utterances accurately reflect his mood for the time being. We can therefore gain a

<sup>1</sup> Edited in various publications.

<sup>2</sup> Edited in various publications. Cf. W. Riedel and W. E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria: The Arabic and Coptic versions*, The Text and Translation Society (London-Oxford, 1904). Recently O. H. E. KHS-Burmester has edited such texts in the review *Le Muséon* (Louvain).

<sup>3</sup> C. Schmidt, *Der erste Clemensbrief in altkoptischer Übersetzung*. Texte (as in n. 5, p. 244), vol. xxxii, no. 1 (Leipzig, 1908); Fr. Rösch, *Bruchstücke des ersten Clemensbriefes* (Strassburg, 1910); L. Th. Lefort, "Les pères apostoliques en copte", *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, vol. cxxxv; French translation, vol. cxxxvi (Louvain, 1952).

<sup>4</sup> J. Leipoldt, *Epiphanius' von Salamis "Ancoratus" in saidischer Übersetzung: Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, liv (1902), 136-71; H. de Vis, *Epiphanius de Gemmis. Coptic-Sahidic fragments edited with a Latin translation: Studies and Documents II* (London, 1934), pp. xxx-xxxix, and 235-335.

<sup>5</sup> L. Th. Lefort, *S. Athanase. Lettres festales et pastorales en copte: Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. cli; French translation: vol. cli (Louvain, 1955).

<sup>6</sup> L. Th. Lefort, *Oeuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples. Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. clx; French translation, vol. clx (Louvain, 1956).

<sup>7</sup> K. H. Kuhn, *Letters and Sermons of Besa: Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. clvii; English translation, vol. clviii (Louvain, 1956).

<sup>8</sup> E. Amélineau, *Oeuvres de Shenoudi. Texte copte et traduction française*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907-11); J. Leipoldt, *Sinuthii Archimandriti vita et opera omnia*, vols. iii and iv, *Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. xlii (Leipzig, 1908), and vol. lxxiii (Paris, 1913). Latin translation by H. Wiesmann, *ibid.* vols. xcvi and cviii. Apart from that there are other fragments edited in various publications.

rather impressive picture of his personality.<sup>1</sup> He was a strong character, extremely active, brutal, a despotic dictator who would not tolerate any opposition. He was a man of action and not of philosophical speculation. He fought by every means against the heathen who were still numerous in his time, as well as against everything contrary to Christian doctrine that he noticed among the Christians. He knew how to express himself in the manner best adapted to his hearers. He was soon the most popular person of his time and the influx into his monastery was so considerable that the number of the monks of the White Monastery soon surpassed that of every other monastery. He exercised a lasting influence on Egyptian Christianity. His writings are highly revered. They have been translated into Greek, Bohairic<sup>2</sup> and Arabic and are still used in the liturgy of the Coptic Church.

There was also a Coptic narrative literature. Part of it is translated from Greek texts. But we may suppose that some of the narratives were written in Coptic in imitation of older texts of this type. Many such texts are biographies of martyrs and saints. They contain many reports of miracles and are of a limited historical value. We possess many such *Vitae*. The most interesting are those of the persons mentioned above, especially of Pachôm<sup>3</sup> and Shenute.<sup>4</sup> The biography of Shenute is, probably rightly, attributed to his pupil and successor Bêsa.

Collections of short stories from the life of monks were very popular. As in these stories the main point is chiefly an utterance of a monk, these collections are called *Apophthegmata*.<sup>5</sup> They

<sup>1</sup> J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe und die Entstehung des national-ägyptischen Christentums. Texte* (as in n. 5, p. 244), NF, vol. x, no. 1 (Leipzig, 1903).

<sup>2</sup> Shenute wrote in Sahidic. <sup>3</sup> L. Th. Lefort, *S. Pachonii vita bohairice scripta: Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. lxxxix (reprint, 1953); Latin translation, vol. cvii (1936); id. *S. Pachonii vitae sahidice scriptae*, ibid. vols. xcix and c (1923).

<sup>4</sup> Bohairic (translated from the original Sahidic); J. Leipoldt, *Sinuthii Archimandritae vita*, I: *Corpus* (as in n. 3, p. 245), vol. xli: Latin translation by H. Wiesmann, ibid. vol. cxxix. Fragments of the Sahidic version are edited in various publications. Shenute's biography was translated into Arabic: E. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux IV<sup>e</sup> et V<sup>e</sup> siècles: Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire*, iv (Paris, 1888), 289-478 (with a French translation).

<sup>5</sup> Edited in various publications, most of them in G. Zoega, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur* (Rome, 1810; Reprint, Leipzig, 1903), without a translation.

convey a very good idea of what the ancient Copts considered to be the ideal attitude of anchorites and monks.

Narratives like these were written for religious edification. Stories with profane subjects are extremely scarce. In fact we know only two such stories, both of them extant only in fragments: parts of a Coptic translation of the Alexander story (Pseudo-Callisthenes)<sup>1</sup> which was widespread in all oriental countries, and a large fragment of a story, apparently composed in Coptic, which we usually call the story of Cambyzes.<sup>2</sup> A Persian king, alternatively called Cambyzes (529-522 B.C.) and Nabuchodonosor (605-562 B.C.) attacks Egypt where King Apries (588-566 B.C.) is reigning.

The *Physiologus* may also be considered to belong to the profane literature of this kind. It is a collection of stories about animals. Heathen in its origin, it was widespread in antiquity. It was adapted in a Christian sense.<sup>3</sup>

The liturgy of the Coptic Church imitates the Byzantine liturgy. The liturgical texts of the orthodox Coptic Church have been edited in Egypt in various publications. The Coptic bishop Raphael Tuk(h)i (Rome) edited those of the united Copts in the eighteenth century.

The Coptic Church uses three different mass texts. Apart from the usual liturgy of St. Basil, there are those which are attributed to Cyril and to Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>4</sup> There are some scarce fragments of the older Sahidic liturgy.<sup>5</sup> Coptic liturgical texts have been translated into European languages.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. v. Lemm, *Der Alexanderroman bei den Kopten: Kaiserl. Russische Akademie der Wissenschaften* (St. Petersburg, 1903).

<sup>2</sup> Latest edition, H. L. Jansen, *The Coptic story of Cambyzes' invasion of Egypt: A critical analysis of its literary form and its historical purpose: Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*, II, *Hist. Filos. Kl.* 1950, no. 2 (Oslo, 1950). The author mentions all the previous literature.

<sup>3</sup> Recently, A. v. Lantschoot, "A propos du *Physiologus*", *Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute*, II = *Coptic Studies in honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Boston, 1950), pp. 339-63.

<sup>4</sup> (Coptic Title) *Tišomti nanaphora nte niagios Basilios nem Gregorios nem Kyrillos* (with an Arabic translation) (Cairo, 1936).

<sup>5</sup> Edited in various publications.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *Coptic Offices*, translated by R. M. Woolley (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1930). In recent years O. H. E. KHS-Burmester has edited and translated many Coptic liturgical texts.

There are some late Coptic manuscripts (tenth century) which contain texts of songs. These texts are certainly older than the manuscripts in which they are preserved. Their literary form is rather artless. Most of the stanzas consist of four lines. There are three or four stressed syllables in each line according to the tune. The tune is indicated at the top of the text by mentioning the first word or words of a model song. The subjects of these texts are taken from the Bible or from legends of saints.<sup>1</sup>

Later on, songs in praise of Mary the mother of the Lord were composed in Bohairic. They are known as *Theotokia*.<sup>2</sup> They paraphrase biblical subjects and are of small poetic value. Songs praising the saints of the day, called Doxologies, must be mentioned here.

The last product of Coptic literature is a long poem called *Triadon*.<sup>3</sup> It was composed perhaps in the thirteenth century, and consisted of 732 stanzas of which 428 are preserved (complete or in fragments). The first three lines of each stanza rhyme together, the last line universally ends in -on (-ôn, -an). This scheme often forced the poet to do violence to the language. The purpose of the poem is to induce the reader to cultivate the Coptic language which had already disappeared from daily use at that time. The poem contains many allusions to biblical subjects, legends of saints, and dogmas, as well as moral admonitions. We do not know whether the author of the poem wrote the Arabic translation himself.

Apart from the literature proper there is a large number of inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> most of them from gravestones. Their contents are usually insignificant and monotonous, mentioning the name of the defunct person and the date of the death.<sup>5</sup> But there are some of a higher literary standard.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Junker, *Koptische Poesie des 10 Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1908, 1911). (Published before in *Oriens Christianus*, vols. vi, vii and viii.) Since Junker's edition some further texts have been edited in various publications.

<sup>2</sup> De Lacy O'Leary, *The Coptic Theotokia* (London, 1923).

<sup>3</sup> O. v. Lemm, *Das Triadon: Ein sahidisches Gedicht mit arabischer Übersetzung*, vol. i: text (no more published), St. Petersburg (Russian Academy), 1903.

<sup>4</sup> A. Mallon, *Copte: Epigraphie*, in Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. iii, no. 2 (Paris, pp. 1914), 2819-86.

<sup>5</sup> Edited in various publications. E.g. Togo Mina, *Inscriptions coptes et grecques de Nubie* (Cairo, 1942).

<sup>6</sup> Collected and dealt with by M. Cramer, *Die Totenklage bei den Kopten*:



A collateral growth of the religious literature is to be seen in the magical texts, of which there is a large number in Coptic.<sup>1</sup> The purposes of these texts are very diverse: love-spells, spells in order to prejudice a person, to cure or to protect someone, etc. in endless variants. Such texts very often contain heathen, Christian, Gnostic and other elements mixed together. In some of these texts we find a special sort of magic alphabet. The strokes of the letters all end in small rings. It is not yet clear in all cases what this script means.<sup>2</sup>

There is nothing in Coptic that we should call scientific literature. What comes nearest to it are the collections of medical recipes.<sup>3</sup> Up to now only one large collection has come to light, although there was a number of them, as the high paginations of some extant leaves show. These recipes do not shed any light on the knowledge of anatomy and the diagnostic methods of the ancient Copts. Among the therapeutic methods there are sometimes some magical elements, and the *Dreck-Apotheke* (dung remedies) play an important part. But on the whole the methods are fairly rational.<sup>4</sup> As far as we can see, there was no other medical literature except recipes.

In this connection I must mention a calculation manual.<sup>5</sup> It tells how to calculate the area of fields, but in a purely empirical way without any theory. It consists only of problems and their solution.

*Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philos.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte*, vol. ccxix, no. 2 (Vienna, 1941).

<sup>1</sup> Collected and dealt with by A. Kropp, *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte*, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1930/1). Others edited after this publication, e.g. V. Stegemann, *Die koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* (as in n. 4, p. 243) and in various articles in reviews.

<sup>2</sup> The magical script has nothing to do with cryptography, which is not uncommon in Coptic. There are various systems. The latest discussion of this subject is J. Doresse, "Cryptographie copte et cryptographie grecque", *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte*, xxxiii (Cairo, 1952), 215-28.

<sup>3</sup> Collected, translated and dealt with by W. Till, *Die Arzneikunde der Kopten* (Berlin, 1951). A supplement in *Le Muséon*, lxxv (Louvain, 1952), 159 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. P. G. Sobhy, "The persistence of ancient Coptic methods of medical treatment in present-day Egypt", *Bulletin* (as in n. 3, p. 247), pp. 185-8.

<sup>5</sup> J. Drescher, "A Coptic calculation manual", *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte*, xiii (Cairo, 1951), 137-60.

Egypt was constantly shaken by vehement quarrels of different kinds in the Coptic period. Political, religious and personal differences caused passionate discussions and struggles. Occasionally outside powers (the Byzantine emperor, the Pope) intervened. At the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) the Coptic Church separated itself as monophysite for ever from the rest of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

The ancient Egyptian had no liking for historical studies. Therefore there are only very scarce historical texts extant in Coptic, in spite of the Coptic period being rich in events and passionate experiences.<sup>2</sup> But these events are reflected occasionally in literary and non-literary texts.

The stories of Cambyses and of Alexander as well as the fragments of the *Physiologos*, mentioned above, cannot be described as scientific works. They are rather works of fiction.

Coptic is also very important for the study of early Christianity because Coptic versions of a large number of Gnostic and Manichaean texts have been found which are unknown in any other language.

All Egyptian Christian reports up to A.D. 180 refer to heretics. There is no evidence of the activity of the Christian Great Church in Egypt for this period. On the other hand, Gnostic doctrines were widespread in Egypt, and many Gnostic books, as well as books influenced by Gnosticism, were written in Egypt. This shows that Gnosticism was a very dangerous rival to Christianity in Egypt in the earliest Christian times.<sup>3</sup> At the end of the

<sup>1</sup> Ethiopia was christianized by Egyptian missionaries (in the sixth century). Therefore the Ethiopic Church is also Monophysite. Its chief (Abuna) was, until a few years ago, always an Egyptian. Coptic is not used in the Ethiopic Church but the ancient Ethiopic language (Ge'ez). The Ethiopic christians should not be called Copts.

<sup>2</sup> O. v. Lemm, *Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchengeschichte Alexandriens: Mémoires de l'Académie imp. des sciences de St.-Petersbourg*, 7<sup>e</sup> série, tome 36, no. 11 (1888) and *Bulletin de l'Académie imp. des sciences de St.-Petersbourg* (1896), tome 4, no. 2. There is a small fragment of an extract from a world chronicle published by P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah* (London, 1954), no. 55, dealt with in detail by C. Gorteman, *Un fragment de Chronique Mondiale: Chronique d'Egypte*, xxxi (Brussels, 1956), 385-402. This papyrus is not a leaf of a book. This is obvious by reason of the facts that it is not written in a literary hand and that the scribe wrote a letter on the other side of the papyrus.

<sup>3</sup> W. Bauer, "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im alten Christentum", *Beiträge*

second century Christianity was strong enough to face Gnosticism, to vanquish it, and, finally, to destroy it entirely.<sup>1</sup>

Our principal sources for the Gnostic and Manichaean doctrines were those early Church Fathers who wrote books against the heresies (heresiomachs), for example, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen. These books were intended to show how stupid and detestable the heretical doctrines were. Therefore they cannot be considered as unprejudiced evidence. This situation will be different as soon as all the Gnostic and Manichaean books in Coptic have been edited.

We have known two Gnostic manuscripts for some time. They are called after previous owners: *Codex Askewianus* (now in the British Museum, London) and *Codex Brucianus* (now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford). The former contains a text known as *Pistis Sophia*. The latter consists of *The two books of Yeû* and a large fragment usually called the titleless script.<sup>2</sup> These texts show the Gnostic doctrine in its final decadent stage.<sup>3</sup>

At the end of the nineteenth century a Coptic manuscript was acquired for the papyrus collection of the Berlin Museum. It contains three Gnostic books: *The Gospel according to Mary* zur *historischen Theologie*, x (Tübingen, 1934), 49 ff.; H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, ii (Leipzig, 1936), 283 f.; C. H. Roberts, "Early Christianity in Egypt", *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, xl (London, 1954), 92 ff.

<sup>1</sup> There is a very rich literature about Gnosticism. Latest works, G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion* (Zürich, 1951); W. Foerster, *Das Wesen der Gnosis: Die Welt als Geschichte*, ii (1955), 100-14. The latest article about the origins of Gnosticism, R. McL. Wilson, *Gnostic Origins: Vigiliae Christianae*, ix (Amsterdam, 1955), 193-211. On the development of Egyptian Gnosticism according to the Coptic texts hitherto published see W. Till, *Die Gnosis in Ägypten: La parola del passato*, xii (Naples, 1949), 231-50.

<sup>2</sup> Latest edition of the titleless work with translation and commentary by C. A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus* (Cambridge, 1933).

<sup>3</sup> The latest translation of the texts of these two codices: C. Schmidt, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, I: Die Pistis Sophia, die beiden Bücher des Jeû, unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk: Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, vol. xlv (13); 2nd edn. by W. Till (Berlin, 1954). In this book there is a list of the literature about these texts. An earlier English translation of the *Pistis Sophia* was published by G. Horner, *Pistis Sophia* (London, 1924).

(Magdalene),<sup>1</sup> *The Apocryphon of John* <sup>2</sup> and *The Sophia of Jesus Christ*. These texts have recently been edited for the first time.<sup>3</sup> They show the Gnostic doctrine in a much earlier stage of development.

The Coptic library of a Gnostic community living in the fourth century in Upper Egypt was found near el-Qaṣr weṣ-Ṣayyâd on the east bank of the Nile opposite Nag' Hammâdi in 1945. This library consists of thirteen manuscripts with forty-eight more or less fully preserved works. One of these manuscripts has found its way into the *Jung-Institut* at Zürich; it is called *Codex Jung*. It contains among other texts *The Gospel of the Truth*, which some scholars think was written by Valentinus.<sup>4</sup> The rest of these manuscripts are now in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo.<sup>5</sup> The manuscripts contain among many other writings a collection of sayings of Jesus called the *Gospel of Thomas*.<sup>6</sup> Some of these sayings were known before from fragments of Greek papyri found at Oxyrhynchus (*Logia Jesu*).

An international committee was formed in 1956 in order to publish all these texts.

<sup>1</sup> There is a fragment of its Greek text in the John Rylands Library, published by C. H. Roberts in the *Catalogue of the Greek papyri in the John Rylands Library*, iii (London, 1938), 18 ff. Cf. W. Till and G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαριάμ: La parola del passato*, i (Naples, 1946), 260-79.

<sup>2</sup> W. Till, "The Gnostic Apocryphon of John", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, iii (London, 1952), 14-22.

<sup>3</sup> W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis, 8502: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. lx. (= 5th Reihe, vol. v) (Berlin, 1955), with German translation and commentary.

<sup>4</sup> F. L. Cross, *The Codex Jung* (London, 1955). This book contains the English translation of some preliminary accounts. After this was published H.-Ch. Puech et G. Quispel, *Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung. Vigiliae Christianae*, ix (1955), 65-102. This article contains a list of literature about the Codex Jung. I understand that this manuscript will be transferred to the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo after the publication of its texts. *Euangelium ueritatis* ed. by M. Malinine, H.-Ch. Puech and J. Quispel: vol. vi. of *Studien aus dem C. G. Jung-Institut* (Zurich, 1956).

<sup>5</sup> The numerous preliminary accounts are mentioned in my edition of the Berlin texts (n. 3, p. 252).

<sup>6</sup> *Euangelium secundum Thomam* ed. by A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Yassa Abd al-Masih is being published by E. J. Brill (Leide).



Most of the Coptic Gnostic texts we know put the doctrine into a framework. Christ appears, after his Resurrection, to one (John, Mary Magdalene) or all of his disciples and gives them his instructions, answering their questions, or teaching without being asked. The very selection of the persons to whom the instructions are given shows that the doctrine is not to be taught to the whole of mankind. Only such people ought to be told the Gnostic doctrine as the teacher is quite sure will fully understand it. This assumes that these persons are not interested in the things of this material world and that, in consequence, their conduct is strictly moral. It is repeatedly stressed that the Gnostic doctrine must not be taught to any person but only to such as have proved to be worthy, and even to those only secretly. Any one who taught it in order to obtain some material gain was threatened with a curse. Gnosticism was strictly esoteric.

The framework mentioned is lacking only in one of the Coptic Gnostic books hitherto published, that is in the so-called titleless work of the *Codex Brucianus*. It is distinctly to be understood to contain the instructions of a human author.

The *Apocryphon of John* was composed not later than in the middle of the second century, for it was used by Irenaeus when writing his *Adversus haereses*. It is not only among the texts of the Berlin manuscript (cf. n. 3, p. 252) but is found in three different recensions in the Gnostic texts of the Coptic Museum. This shows that it was considered to be of outstanding importance. Indeed it contains an outline of the whole system in a stage still close to its origin. The original line of thinking and arguing is still clear in it. It is designed to answer the burning questions : how evil has come into the world where it plays such a prevailing part and how man can be saved from it. These queries are not expressed in the text but understood.

The following may be taken as a short sketch of the fundamental ideas as shown in the *Apocryphon of John*. The system is strictly dualistic. We have the antithesis : light, spirit, perfection, goodness on the one side : darkness, matter, imperfection, evil, the *Cosmos* on the other side.

The supreme being is entirely immaterial and has no material qualities whatsoever but is a pure being of light and spirit. It

cannot have anything in common with this bad material *Cosmos*. The latter is rather the creation of a stupid, ugly, malignant, imperious and arrogant being, whose name is Yaldabaoth. He is clearly meant to be the God of the Old Testament. He is the son of Sophia, the latest divine emanation. She has borne him without the consent of God ; therefore he has all bad qualities. But he has inherited a divine spark from his mother and this enables him to create the material *Cosmos*.

The beings of the world of light try to get back this divine spark which had passed out of Yaldabaoth into man. Both the divine world of light and the powers of the material world try to win man entirely and for ever. The struggle is fought for and inside every man. Everybody who has been taught the Gnostic doctrine knows that his very self is of divine origin and longs to return out of this bad material world into the divine world of light. He has lost all interest in material things and after his death he will return into the world of light for ever. But he who has not obtained this knowledge continues to be entangled in material interests of all sorts. After his death his soul is to be born again in a human body. He must return again and again into this material world till he too obtains the redeeming knowledge.

Owing to this mental attitude no moral code was necessary. Moreover, the Gnostics were against begetting children because this brings new divine sparks into Yaldabaoth's power.

The Old Testament is acknowledged as being true. But as it is written from Yaldabaoth's point of view it must be understood in the Gnostic sense. Yaldabaoth had put the first man into Paradise and given him a wife in order to make him love this material world and to bind him to his sphere of power. Moreover, he forbade him to eat from the tree of knowledge because man, doing so, would gain the knowledge of his divine origin and would try to escape from this material world. Christ, another emanation from God, induced man to eat from the tree of knowledge. Therefore Paradise turned out to be useless for Yaldabaoth and he turned man out of it.

This philosophical background of the system was very soon lost. We find something entirely different in the texts of the

*Codices Askewianus* and *Brucianus*, which are perhaps a hundred years later than the *Apocryphon of John*. Among the exuberantly growing excrescences of fantasy we find only sparse and scattered fragments of the well-articulated original system. They have changed their original meaning or ceased to have any meaning at all.

Even the way of salvation has entirely changed. At the beginning "Gnosis", i.e. knowing the truth about the divine origin of man, was the key to salvation. Mental turning away from the material *Cosmos*, longing towards the divine world of light, and a moral life is still necessary but by no means sufficient for salvation. The most important, even indispensable thing, is quite a new element: the mysteries. These are cultic ceremonies similar to the Christian sacraments (baptism, eucharist). They are given to the believers in a certain sequence according to their worthiness. No soul, be it even entirely sinless, can come into the world of light and stay there without having received mysteries. The higher the grade of the last mystery the soul has received the higher is the place in the world of light to which it can penetrate.

The mysteries are described in the books of Yeû and some in the fourth book of the *Pistis Sophia*.

Moreover the *Pistis Sophia* contains a list of virtues which are recommended to the Gnostics, as well as a list of sins and crimes mentioning the proper punishment for each. We see by this that the high moral level of the *Apocryphon of John* was abandoned. Apparently the principle of strict esoteric was not kept well although we find the curse against those who give mysteries to unworthy persons again in the first book of Yeû.

Among the books of the Gnostic library found in Upper Egypt there are also five hermetic books. So we expect a considerable and valuable increase of our knowledge in this highly interesting field.<sup>1</sup>

A Coptic Manichaean library was found near Medînet Mâdi (in the Fayyum) in 1930. As these manuscripts were exposed to the damp soil for many centuries they are by no means so well

<sup>1</sup> H.-Ch. Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Egypte", *Bulletin* (as in n. 3, p. 247), pp. 91-154.

preserved as the Gnostic manuscripts of Upper Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Their restoration is extremely difficult, and they cannot be easily read. The find was divided between the British collector Mr. A. Chester Beatty and the papyrus collection of the Berlin Museum.<sup>2</sup>

The second great war has delayed the publication of the Coptic Manichaean texts. Some of the persons who were active in the work are now dead (C. Schmidt, H. Ibscher, C. R. C. Allberry). Three volumes, containing texts and translations, were published before the war; the homilies,<sup>3</sup> a part of the Psalms<sup>4</sup> and a part of the *Kephalaia*.<sup>5</sup>

A few years ago R. Ibscher resumed the work of restoration of the Manichaean papyri of the Chester Beatty collection where his father, H. Ibscher, had left it when he died.<sup>6</sup> Let us hope that the work can be continued and that H. J. Polotsky (now at Jerusalem) and A. Böhlig (now at Halle), and perhaps others, can edit further texts of the Coptic Manichaean library. These texts are especially important because they are translations of texts which Mani himself and his immediate disciples wrote. The Manichaean texts found in Asia are of a much later date.

Mani (A.D. 216-277), the originator of Manichaeism, was born in Babylonia where he was acquainted, while still young, with many religious and philosophical systems. He felt called to create a new religious doctrine. He called himself an "Apostle of Jesus Christ", and thought he was the incarnation of the Paraclete promised by Jesus. He wrote down his own doctrine in order to prevent its corruption.

<sup>1</sup> C. Schmidt und H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten, Sitzungsbericht der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1933, no. 1 (Berlin, 1933).

<sup>2</sup> The Chester-Beatty collection is now in Dublin. The Berlin Manichaean texts (and most of the other papyri) were carried off by the Russians when they conquered Berlin in 1945. Where they are now is not known.

<sup>3</sup> [H. J. Polotsky], *Manichäische Homilien* (Stuttgart, 1934).

<sup>4</sup> C. R. C. Allberry, *A Manichaean Psalm-book*, part ii (Stuttgart, 1938). These psalms are cultic songs. Cf. T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-book: Prosody and Mandaean Parallels* (Uppsala, 1949).

<sup>5</sup> [A. Böhlig], *Kephalaia*, I. Band (Stuttgart, 1940). These texts contain stories and instructions of different kinds.

<sup>6</sup> R. Ibscher, *Das Restaurierungswerk an den manichäischen Texten: Forschungen und Fortschritte*, xxix (Berlin, 1955), 216-21.



Mani's system is a special sort of Gnosis. Its base is a strict dualism: light = good, darkness = evil. He does not try to explain how evil came into existence. He supposes that both light (spirit) and darkness (matter) existed from the beginning. Originally these two "natures" were strictly separated. At a certain time a mixture took place by means of an encroachment of demons of the darkness. They swallowed some light, and this must be rescued from their power and brought back to the world of light. The original strict separation must be restored. The system and the methods of salvation seem to us complicated.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from the literary Coptic texts there are many non-literary ones. The most important of them are the legal documents. Coptic never was the language of the rulers of Egypt. Before 641 the rulers were Greek (or Romans respectively); after that date Arabs. In consequence certain kinds of documents were never written in Coptic.<sup>2</sup>

The Coptic legal documents deal with such cases as relate to inhabitants of the countryside: documents concerning taxes (especially tax receipts), betrothal, marriage, divorce, sale, donation, exchange, lease, loan, pledge, different kinds of surety and guarantee, safe conduct, working, tilling, wills, dialyseis (arrangements), decrees, petitions and the like. Most of the Coptic documents have the same, or a very similar formula, as the late Byzantine Greek documents. They are highly important not only for the history of law, but also from the point of view of folklore.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Latest descriptions of the system, H. J. Polotsky, "Abriss des manichäischen Systems": Pauli-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband vi (Stuttgart, 1934), pp. 241-72; H.-Ch. Puech, *Le manichéisme. La vie de son fondateur—sa doctrine*, Paris, 1949; id. *Die Religion des Mani: Christus und die Religionen der Erde*, ii. 501-63.

<sup>2</sup> The latest description of the law as represented in the Coptic documents is by A. Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden: Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 10. Abteilung, 4. Teil, 2. Band (Munich, 1955). The most important earlier literature is listed in W. Till, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen auf Grund der koptischen Urkunden: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte*, vol. ccxix, no. 2 (Vienna, 1954), 86.

<sup>3</sup> For the numerous publications of Coptic legal documents cf. the bibliographies or Steinwenter's latest treatise (mentioned in n. 2 of p. 257). My edition of more than 200 such texts (*Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden der Wiener Papyrussammlung: Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, vol. iv) is being published in Vienna.

The same holds good for the numerous Coptic letters of all kinds which must be considered along with the legal documents. Letters are often not quite easy to understand. They are destined only for the addressee, or at least for a small number of persons to whom the circumstances mentioned or alluded to in the letter are familiar and so very often we cannot understand to what the text relates. Moreover, letters are often written by persons not much skilled in writing, and not well acquainted with orthography and style. They write a vulgar sort of language in a fancy spelling and very often it is difficult or even impossible for us to guess what they mean. But in spite of such difficulties the non-literary texts offer the most vivid picture of the daily life of the people out of which these texts were born.

Beginning from the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs (A.D. 641) Coptic was gradually superseded by Arabic, which finally became the sole language of Egypt. This development certainly came to an end much later in the Christian villages of Upper Egypt than in the rest of the country. Hence it is impossible to give a fixed date when Coptic disappeared from the daily life of the Egyptians. Today Coptic (the Bohairic dialect) is used only in the liturgy of the Coptic Church, and "Copt" means a member of that Church.<sup>1</sup> The Copts are the direct descendants of the ancient Egyptians, for they did not intermarry with the Mohammedan Arabs. But their language in daily life is Arabic today like that of all Egyptians.

<sup>1</sup> There are also Catholic and Protestant Copts. About Copts in general, cf. Sir Stephen Gaselee, "The Copts", *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, xxiv (1937), 27-45; W. H. Worrell, *A short account of the Copts* (Ann Arbor, 1945).







A miniature from the "Charles VII Book of Hours" in the John Rylands Library. French. 15th cent., first half.

The view, which is that of Paris with St. Genevieve kneeling in prayer over the city, is notable for its full detail and for the fact that the various buildings are shown in perspective.